

RELIGION IN LIFE

A CHRISTIAN QUARTERLY of opinion and discussion

VOL. XXIV

Summer, 1955

NO. 3

CONTENTS

| | |
|--|---------------------------|
| What Is the Minister's Real Task? | 323 |
| RALPH W. SOCKMAN, ILION T. JONES, REUEL L. HOWE, JAMES D. SMART | |
| What the Layman Expects From His Minister..... | J. STANFORD SMITH 361 |
| The Institutional Forms of Christian Culture..... | CHRISTOPHER DAWSON 373 |
| Fundamentalism and Modernism in Perspective..... | ROBERT T. HANDY 381 |
| Biblical Theology and Philosophy..... | RUSSELL F. ALDWINCKLE 395 |
| Political Morality and the Businessman..... | KERMIT EBY 408 |
| Simone Weil and Metapolitics..... | ERNEST WALL 417 |
| “The Third Hour”..... | MARIA F. SULZBACH 430 |
| Recent Books on Jesus and His Ministry..... | ALEXANDER C. PURDY 436 |
| Literature of the History of Methodism..... | EDWARD L. FORTNEY 443 |
| Book Reviews | 452 |
| Book Notices | 479 |

THE QUOTIDIEN

THE DAILY PRAYER BOOK FOR CHILDREN

Quotidian Prayer

THOMAS FULLER

AMONGST OTHER ARGUMENTS enforcing the necessity of daily prayer, this not the least, that Christ enjoins us to petition for daily bread. New bread we know is best; and in a spiritual sense our bread, though in itself as stale and mouldy as that of the Gibeonites, is every day new, because a new and hot blessing, as I might say, is daily begged, and bestowed of God upon it.

Manna must daily be gathered, and not provisionally be hoarded up. God expects that men every day address themselves unto Him, by petitioning Him for sustenance.

How contrary is this to the common practice of many. As camels in sandy countries are said to drink but once in seven days, and then in *praesens*, *praeteritum*, *et futurum*, for time past, present, and to come, so many fumble this, last, and next week's devotions all in a prayer. Yea, some defer all their praying till the last day.

Constantine had a conceit that because baptism washed away all sins, he would not be baptized till his death-bed, that so his soul might never lose the purity thereof, but immediately mount to heaven. But sudden death preventing him, he was not baptized at all, as some say, or only by an Arian bishop, as others affirm. If any erroneously, on the same supposition, put off their prayers to the last, let them take heed lest, long delayed, they proved either none at all or none in effect.

—Thomas Fuller, *Good Thoughts in Worse Times* (1647), quoted in *A Diary of Readings*, ed. by John Baillie. Chas. Scribner's Sons, 1955. Day 128. Used by permission.

What Is the Minister's Real Task?

RALPH W. SOCKMAN

IN MY CHURCH are many members with medical degrees. But not one of them can I call my family doctor. They are all specialists. The general practitioner of medicine is becoming almost an extinct species in our large cities.

Are we seeing a similar trend in the ministerial profession? Note the number of seminarians preparing for specialized fields, such as teaching in theological and undergraduate schools, counseling, journalism, chaplaincies in industry and military service. Although our seminaries are prevailingly full, our pulpits are hard to fill.

Ours is an age of specialization. In the secular field one almost has to specialize in order to get ahead. As a result of this specialization, Alfred Noyes asserted that we are misled by "small clever minds," that is, minds which know their own line but do not see where their lines fit the general pattern of society.

The pulpit stands where the specialties meet. One of its primary functions is to help men "see life steadily and see it whole." If the church defaults in its interpretation of life's wholeness, how will the human horizons be enlarged? If the parish minister limits himself to leading community reforms, he will flog the wills of his people but not feed their minds. If he lets it be known that his specialty is counseling, he is likely to find his time consumed by the "abnormals" to the neglect of the "normals."

The idea seems to be abroad in some quarters that the preaching function of the church can be performed for us by a comparatively small group of speakers. A few years ago the head of a large theological seminary asked me to allay the fears aroused in his student body by a previous speaker, who had said that in the future preaching would be mainly done by radio personalities and prophetic voices radiating from seminary cloisters. He left the impression that the local minister's office would be reduced to that of managing his parish and counseling with his members. Such a prediction is

RALPH W. SOCKMAN, Ph.D., LL.D., S.T.D., has been for nearly forty years Minister of Christ Church, Methodist, Park Avenue, New York City; is Chairman of the World Peace Commission of The Methodist Church, and Associate Professor of Practical Theology at Union Theological Seminary. He holds that the minister's task is "to preach the *whole gospel*."

most misleading. It overlooks the fact that voices out of the air lack the force of personal influence and seminary professors, however prophetic, can hardly speak to the life situations of daily living. The "man of God" moving among his people affects their lives as can no radio speaker or roving "prophet." Helpful preaching grows from the soil of pastoral cultivation. No pulpit can keep "ringing the bell" unless its occupant rings the doorbell.

The local church, as the "House of God," renders a unique service through the conduct of worship and no modern invention can replace it. The parish minister, as the priest at the altar and as the shepherd of souls, fulfills the twofold function mentioned by Isaiah: he "prepares the way of the Lord" and also, he "prepares the way of the people." Thus he gains a hearing for the gospel not attainable by other means.

Moreover, the local minister is the custodian of the crises of life. When he stands before a couple in the high mystical moment of marriage, and lays his baptizing hands on the heads of the newborn, and clasps with comfort the groping hands of the bereaved in the hours of grief, the pastor gains entree to human hearts in a way not paralleled elsewhere. His heart may ache because more people do not come to church, but he should remember that they come when life seems most important to them.

Through the personal confidence thus gained, the pastor opens a way for the social implications of the gospel. Laymen will often listen to their trusted minister interpret the economic and social aspects of the Christian faith, whereas few of them ever read the pronouncements of general church bodies in these fields. Thus the parish pastor is the mediator between the specialized social prophets and the man in the pews.

If the minister is to fulfill this function as mediator between the personal and the social he must try to keep a wholeness of outlook which includes both. Some years ago a minister of my acquaintance was practically forced out of his church. The report was that he had preached the social gospel to the point where it irritated his people. Considerable mention of it was made in the public press. One of his laymen was reported as making this comment: "We did not object so much to what Dr. X said, but to what he did not say." Apparently the minister had been criticized for an utterance on some social question and the criticism gave him a sort of martyr complex. Picking at the wound inflicted upon him, he then neglected the healing aspects of his ministry. Recurring repeatedly to his social theme, he failed to give his people any message of comfort or personal help. Paganini could make harmony on one string, but most of us are not Paganinis. If we are to preach the whole

gospel, we must proclaim its comfort and its challenge, its commands and its promises, its responsibilities and its rewards.

Although I am a poor demonstrator of this desired ministry, the editor has asked that this article be in part a description of personal experience. Hence I shall speak in the first person.

The late Dr. Harris E. Kirk of Baltimore was wont to say that a minister should let his mind lie fallow for at least one month a year, allowing it to take in whatever falls on it. I have tried to follow his advice during the summer months. On my vacations I read the books which I enjoy and which I have been too busy to devour during the winter. The selection is rather general, some biographies, some travel books, some theological treatises, some fiction, yes, even some mystery stories. In my choice I am guided by the book reviews in journals like this, *The Christian Century*, and others.

While I seldom find seed thoughts or sermon themes in detective stories, I do in most other books. Hence I carry a pad and bring back from a summer's reading perhaps a hundred seminal ideas. Once I thought I could save time and get ahead by preparing sermon outlines in the summer. But it did not work. The points I fell in love with in August grew cold and lost their appeal in December. And of the suggestive ideas which I collect, only a small fraction come to fruition in my sermons. Nevertheless, broad, easy, rather lazy reading in the summer seems to fertilize my mind.

In preparing my sermons I try to keep my themes planned at least two months ahead. In order to keep from being narrowed by my own predilections, I have several guides. One is the church year. While I cannot follow a schedule of weekly messages prepared for me by others, I do observe the seasons of Advent and Lent and most of our major holidays. The pulpit should catch and interpret the moods associated with Thanksgiving Day, the birthdays of the great in February, the remembrance of the dead on Memorial Day, the upsurge of patriotism on July fourth, the recognition of Labor in September. Like other ministers I am irked by the endless requests to observe special Sundays, but I do take note of Brotherhood Week in February and of Family Week in May. There is a sense of nationwide and church-wide community which comes from the common stressing of certain emphases.

In my parish we have another guide for the selection of our sermon themes. Our Board of Education, representative of all our church departments, prepares each year an outline for study. This past year it was "From Belief to Christian Action"; last year the general theme was "Courage to Be Christian in Today's World." The purpose of such a schedule is that all the

sections of our Church School and our University of Life may be studying the same general subjects at approximately the same periods. We believe that themes presented from the pulpit and the various group platforms in the parish are clarified by discussion and laboratory practice.

Moreover, in both the selection and the treatment of themes, I am guided by the basic twofold need which, as Henry Pitney Van Dusen says, gives rise to religious interest. This double-pronged desire is for light on the meaning of life and for power for the mastery of life. Life is both a quest and a conquest. We need the "know-why" as well as the "know-how." If one looks at the current output of the press, I think he will note a prevalence of "how" books. Even *The New Yorker* has lampooned this trend toward popular books which furnish neat formulae for solving our personal problems. The defect of such books is not only that many of them offer too easy answers for the questions people ask, but that they do not stir people to ask better and bigger questions. A good teacher is not content to help her pupils with the problems which they bring to her. She also seeks to awaken their minds to new wonders and start them on new quests. Not all the laymen in our pews are tired businessmen who need a shot in the arm to keep them going. Some need new ideas in the head to show them where to go.

Faith is both an attitude of mind and a content of mind. When we say to our people, "Have faith," we are urging them to cultivate what William James called the "will to believe." And such an attitude is essential to religious experience. "He that cometh to God must believe that he is." But a mere affirmative mind does not equip an effective Christian. He must learn what he can affirm. To "have a faith" is more than merely to "have faith." And the pulpit must help the laity attain both.

We Protestants pride ourselves that we are the teaching church. But the war records revealed a sad religious illiteracy. The weakness of much old-fashioned revivalism was that it converted the will without going on to cultivate the mind and taste. Modern religious education has sought to correct this defect. But, alas, we preachers are not all keeping up with our directors of Christian education. It was said of the late Charles E. Jefferson of Broadway Tabernacle that a few years in his congregation were the equivalent of many months' study in a theological seminary. So well did Dr. Jefferson plan his sermons and his midweek messages that he covered great areas of biblical exposition and theological doctrines. Most of us have to confess that our preaching lacks such systematic planning and surrenders too much to opportunistic pressures.

Yes, and to popular taste. We all know that psychological preaching today evokes widespread interest. After the strain of World War I came Mr. Coué and a whole spate of books on the so-called "new psychology." World War II brought a similar aftermath. Radio sermons on anxiety and fear and security bring an avalanche of mail, while calls to social responsibility are followed by a comparative trickle. But if the pulpit plays only the little popular tunes, the people will forget the great oratorios of the faith, with their notes of repentance and forgiveness, of sacrifice and service. A little luncheon group of professors at Cornell said to me some time ago that we need less psychology and more philosophy in the pulpit. There is an old Persian legend of the father who left his son with a mirror; when he returned after some months the lad had starved to death looking at himself. We must beware lest our souls be starved by self-centered introspection.

To be sure, we must minister in the name of Christ the Great Physician as well as teach in the name of the Master Teacher. More than once I have raised the window of my eighth-floor apartment and listened to New York at midnight. In my imagination I have tried to picture what suffering and sorrow lie hidden behind those dark walls and in those wells of darkness. I think of those who lie in hospital wards when the lights are off but sleep is not on, of those who toss restlessly in mental torment which Park Avenue luxury cannot alleviate, of little children who sleep in unsanitary rooms and will wake to play in dirty littered streets. The minister who does not wince at the misery still lingering in this land of plenty cannot preach the whole gospel.

No man of my acquaintance has better fulfilled the all-round function of the parish minister than the late Henry Sloane Coffin. It was reported in the days of his active pastorate that he made about a thousand calls a year. He did not advertise himself as a specialist in counseling and sit in his office waiting for the distressed to come. There are persons so reserved that they do not bring their problems to the pastor's office. Their needs may be even deeper than those who run to every listener who will lend an ear. But to the trusted pastor who calls as a friend these shy souls do unlock their secrets. We must keep our pastoral counseling personalized lest it become coldly professionalized. I venture to believe that more effective counseling is done by plain run-of-the-street pastors than by many who talk and write so much about it.

Lest I appear old-fashioned, let me hasten to say that I believe in training for pastoral counseling. Splendid courses in this field are now being

given at some of our leading seminaries. I wish that I might have had such preparation. But what I am stressing is that we should carry our counseling ministry to those who may not come for it, and not allow our time to be consumed by the chronic confidants.

We have scarcely yet touched the fringes of the new frontier where religion and health meet. Sharing the sessions of a recent pastors' conference with Dr. Russell Dicks, I had my eyes opened to the avenues by which religion is advancing into the field of health. Here is an area which calls for specialized experts. But should it be limited to them? When I am confronted with a serious case of mental or bodily ill health, I want the co-operation of a trained specialist. But the pastor who is intelligently alert to the spiritual aspects of health can do much in what might be called preventive mental medicine. In my opinion Jesus' greatest healing work was not in the specific cases which he cured but in the cultivation of a healthy-mindedness which put the body in proper subordination to the spirit. He imparted a spirit which enabled men to say as Paul said, "I keep the body under." To do this, the minister does not need to be always giving formulae for curing complexes and overcoming fear. Let him proclaim the gospel in its fullness until men seek a wholeness of life which is more than mere "wellness" of body. "Health" and "wholeness" come from the same root, but physical health does not always mean spiritual wholeness.

Modern man is tired, but his weariness is not primarily due to the heaviness of his labors. Our hours of work are shorter than in our fathers' day. Our modes of living are more comfortable. Our bodies are not overburdened. Our trouble is mainly that we are tired of ourselves. We need to be relaxed not by an easy religion but by stretching our larger muscles. We must break the strain of self-centeredness by getting out of ourselves and into causes bigger than ourselves. And the minister is an officer serving under "the captain of our salvation" to save his people by enlisting them in good causes.

Most of our people are normal human beings. We serve them best not by treating them as problems but by setting them to solving the problems of society. They need to be challenged as well as comforted. The pastor is expected to lead his people in community activities. A great tribute is paid to the clergy by the continuous demands made on them for community leadership. Here they must keep a sense of proportion lest too much time be consumed in extra-parish programs. Sick causes can often dissipate energy which could better be given to sick cases. Let us beware of being chore boys

for every organization which calls for help. But high is the service and deep is the satisfaction of the discriminating minister who builds himself into the life of his community. Dr. Fosdick once said to me that he wished I could have had some part of my ministry in a town or small city where I could have gotten the feeling of being a real factor in the life of the place. New York City is too big to preserve the community feeling, but even in a metropolis a minister can make his civic influence felt if he gives enough thought to his public utterances and enough effort to his public activities so that they come to win respect.

And we should remember that in the mass living of metropolitan life, the parish church is one of the remaining preservatives of the community spirit. Geographical location begets no community feeling. In New York, for example, there is no Park Avenue Neighborhood spirit, no Greenwich Village cohesion. Once our cities were called melting pots. Now they are like sand piles, multitudes of individualists piled together with no sense of unity. But there can be a Christ Church community, a Brick Church community, a Protestant community. My church contains some four hundred single women. We try to supply them with some of the social values normally provided by family and community.

Furthermore, the minister must not forget his prophetic function. He is an interpreter of our complex social issues to confused minds. He cannot presume to be an expert in the economic or political field. And he should not commit a sin against fair play by using his pulpit to thrust his specific political proposals down the throats of a congregation which is restrained by ecclesiastical dignity from replying. But the preacher is called to apply Christian principles to public situations, to apply the gospel to systems as well as to souls. Since my congregations at the heart of the city contain so many visitors, I try to combine the personal with the social in each sermon. That is, it is not my practice to devote a whole sermon to a subject like disarmament or racial segregation, but to preach on texts and principles which can frequently flash their facets of application toward these issues. In this way I do not give what may seem a stone to some sorrowing visitor who is looking for the bread of comfort. Also, by slipping my references to these issues into frequent sermons, I am more likely to reach my rather irregular members and maybe hit with a Davidic stone some Goliath who would be armored against the subject if he saw it coming.

Also if we are to preach the whole gospel, we must emphasize the church and interpret it to the people. One of the weaknesses of so much

current popular religion is that it is so individualistic. A congregation is so often just a crowd of spiritual hermits who come to get their little cup of satisfaction and then go back to their caves. Like the members of the numerous cults, they come to get rather than to give. Here is a point to be watched in these days of a so-called religious boom. Jesus drew large crowds in his early ministry. Some came out of curiosity, some to be fed, some to be healed. But Jesus did not form his church out of the crowds he fed and healed. He developed a hard core of eleven faithful disciples, and from these came the Christian church. Not self-centered crowds but God-consecrated churchmen are the hope of a true religious revival. And the man of God moving among his people, representing as best he can, Christ the Teacher, the Physician, the Prophet, the Head of the church—he is the indispensable man.

Perhaps each pastor should set for himself a hierarchy of values if he is to preserve a balance in his effort to preach the whole gospel. Principal P. T. Forsyth in his Yale Lectures said that he was guided by the following loyalties in the following order:

- 1: To the gospel
- 2: To the local church
- 3: To the church at large
- 4: To the public.

Perhaps you will question Forsyth's order. Then make one for yourself.

And over and above all, the preacher speaks for Christ the Savior. About three years ago a ship was wrecked just offshore at Beirut. Tom Ball, an American passenger, swam out and saved three persons. Modestly he said something which *The Christian Century* called one of the most memorable utterances of the year 1952. This is what he said: "It's a wonderful thing to reach down and feel a hand clasp yours and know you've saved a life." When all is said and done, that is the greatest satisfaction afforded by preaching the whole gospel.

From Ilion T. Jones

DESPITE THE VARIOUS ramifications of the minister's task that have developed under modern conditions, *preaching and leading in worship* still have the special importance they have held throughout Christian history. Preaching and leading in worship are considered together in this symposium because they belong together, and together they constitute the unique contribution of the minister which no professor, secular counselor, or social worker can provide.

Sometimes the two tasks have been set over against each other as if they were different things. Such is not the case. Worship *includes* preaching. Preaching is a component part of worship, not something added to it, not something taking place when the worship part of the service has been finished. Some people speak of the acts of worship previous to the sermon as "the preliminaries." Others are heard frequently to say that people go to church to worship God, not to hear a man speak. Both these attitudes are unfortunate. All parts of the service, including the sermon, are constituent elements of the service as a whole. All are essential to a complete, well-rounded service of public worship.

THE COMPOSITE NATURE OF PUBLIC WORSHIP

Public worship is a complex not a simple experience, a series of approaches to God, not a single approach. Each composite part of the worship service is in itself a true act of worship that makes its own distinctive contribution to the service as a whole. The separate parts taken together are designed to embody all that the God-man relation involves. We worship together to sense God's presence, to adore and praise him, to express gratitude to him, to confess our sins and seek forgiveness, to come better to understand our duty to him and our obligations to one another, to find relief for our burdens, solutions for our problems, deliverance from our griefs, guilt, fears and worries, to gather sustenance for our souls, to get resources for living. Corporate worship is not any one of these experiences alone but all of them together. In short, it is man's total experience of fellowship with God.

We might adapt Paul's figure of speech in 1 Corinthians 12:14ff

ILION T. JONES, B.D., A.M., D.D., is Professor of Practical Theology at San Francisco Theological Seminary, San Anselmo, California, and formerly spent nearly thirty years in three Presbyterian pastorates. He analyzes here the indispensable importance of preaching and leading in worship.

and say: Worship does not consist of one element but of many. If the music should say, "Because I am not the sermon, I do not belong to the service," that would not make it any less a part of the service. If the whole service were the sermon, where would the prayers be? If the whole service were prayers, where would the sermon be? There are many parts, yet one service. The music cannot say to the offering, "I have no need of you"; nor the prayers to the sermon, "I have no need of you"; nor again the sermon to the choir, "I have no need of you." The worship service is a whole, and each element is individually a member of it.

PUBLIC WORSHIP A PASTORAL ACTIVITY

Likewise, worship and pastoral activity are not to be completely detached from or set over against one another. In reality, conducting worship is an essential part of a minister's pastoral work. A good case can be made for considering it the most important single duty of his pastoral office. In an important sense what grows out of the Sunday worship experience determines the quality of everything else that goes on during the week.

Frederick C. Grant has said that "religion is life controlled by the consciousness of God." Sunday is the day and the worship service in the church the time and place where a concentrated, concerted effort is made to make the church family conscious of God. Actually, God is no closer in the house of worship than in homes or in places of business or in workshops. But the place of worship and the service of worship are such as to make it easier to become aware of God's nearness there than in other places. The service and the surroundings are intended to help people believe that God is, that they are accountable to him, that they should and may have fellowship with him, and to enable them both to understand and experience all that flows from those beliefs.

The church is distinguished from all other institutions of society at precisely this point: it was established and is maintained for the express purpose of making people aware of God, of his presence, of his claims, of his expectations, of his love and power. Essentially and primarily the work of a minister is not administrative, nor organizational, nor social, nor educational, but spiritual. His supreme function is to influence and aid people to live religiously. To live religiously is to live in the knowledge that life is a great trust, a solemn stewardship under God. The success of the church itself and of every other social institution depends upon whether the church can succeed in producing men who are God's men, men dominated and controlled by their allegiance to God, equipped by God

with the inner resources necessary for their tasks. Hence, the whole program of the church centers or focuses on a weekly worship service that is designed to lead men to experience—vitaly and vividly to experience—God. There God comes alive for them. There they become alive to God.

So once a week the church fellowship gathers for family worship under the leadership of the official head of the family, the pastor. They come together to express their common thanksgiving, to confess their common sins, to experience their common brotherhood under a common Father, to get their bearings, to discover what life is for and what it can mean, to get the spiritual equipment, resources and power for living. That service is their weekly spiritual meal, as indispensable to the inner man as daily meals for the body. The pastor's responsibility is to plan the service so it will achieve those ends. For that reason it is the most important single thing he can do in any given week for his parishioners. That is the acme of the week's pastoral activities. What happens there gives direction and purpose to, sets the tone for, colors and vitally affects everything else in the life of the church. Such is the high meaning of the weekly worship service.

Unquestionably this lays a heavy responsibility upon the pastor. To begin with, he must know how to worship and must experience in his own life the results of worship. Before he can make others conscious of God he must himself be conscious of God. Before God can come alive to others he must first come alive to the minister. If the minister hopes to persuade others to live their lives in the light of God, he must have a contagious, sincere enthusiasm for such living. When asked his opinion of the kind of person needed as the pastor of a vacant parish, Carlyle replied, "What this parish needs is a man who knows God otherwise than by hearsay." A firsthand experiential knowledge of God on the part of the pastor is his first requisite for conducting public worship.

Also, he must have a firsthand knowledge of the needs of the people and a yearning to satisfy them. Phillips Brooks used to say that no man should choose the ministry unless he has a "quality that kindles at the sight of men." No man should undertake to lead in worship unless his heart kindles at the prospect of what may happen to people when they worship. The pastor alone knows the parish as a whole and the human situations faced by members of the congregation on any particular Sunday. He alone understands the specific needs of the worshipers on that day. Therefore he only is capable of planning a worship service to fit the situations and to meet the needs.

This article is not expected to deal with the details of how such a service may be planned, but only to emphasize the importance of that task. Let it be said briefly, though, that the minister must have a working familiarity with the several elements that go to make up a worship service, with their various forms and types, and with the ways in which they may be utilized for the varied purposes of worship. Every weekly service must be separately worked out by him, step by step, item by item, for specific aims. Normally the general *outline* of the order of service will be determined by the customs of the denomination or of the local congregation. But the *content* of each element in the service will be left to his judgment. He should choose, not at random, but for definite purposes and to meet known needs.

Thus each service is a special invention or creation, unlike any other service that has gone before, except in general outline. Someone has called this a weekly "drama of devotion." All is planned and executed as carefully as the dramatist maps out his play so as to lead to its denouement. The minister, congregation, organist and choir cooperate in carrying the service through to its conclusion. Parts of the service will be spoken by the minister and parts by the congregation. Parts will be sung, parts played. Parts will take place in silence. All will be unified around the purposes in the mind of the leader for that particular occasion. Usually the service will not and should not be unified around one idea or mood, or proceed upon a single level. Rather its unity should be like that of a symphony. There should be sequences of movements, contrasting moods, different states of feeling, alternating types of material, until the service reaches its climactic ending, an ending planned by the leader from the beginning.

THE CENTRALITY OF THE SERMON IN WORSHIP

Hardly a year goes by that someone does not decry the importance of preaching in the worship of the church and suggest either that it be put in a subordinate position in worship or be eliminated from it. Those who take this position manifest both a low view of preaching and a defective conception of worship. Specifically they fail to understand the necessity of bringing all the higher elements of human personality into the worship of God.

This position is found most often among those who claim that worship in a sanctuary with a divided chancel is "God-centered" but that worship in a sanctuary with a central pulpit is "man-centered." That claim grows out of loose, careless thinking. Those who make it do not mean, although

they do imply, that God is visible to worshipers in one type of sanctuary but not in another, and that they propose doing away with a human leader in worship. The claim can mean only one, or both, of two things: that one type of sanctuary has an object or objects that, in the judgment of some people, are more satisfactory than a pulpit or organ pipes for the focus of attention and as the symbol of God's presence; and that it is desirable to have the service conducted by a man from positions other than behind a central pulpit. But satisfactory worship in all architectural arrangements requires a leader who necessarily must occupy the center of attention when he is in action. Worship in one type of sanctuary is, and can be, no more God-centered and no less man-centered than in any other type.

Those who call worship conducted from a central pulpit man-centered usually say, or imply, that they doubt whether the sermon has a right to be classified as worship, or that they think it has worship values of secondary importance. One is given the impression that they believe God can be worshiped effectively through the *printed* words of the Bible, of a prayer book, of hymns and anthems, that are read or sung by the leader, the choir, and the congregation, but that he cannot be worshiped effectively through the *spoken* words of the preacher. As stated previously, the sermon and the other parts of worship ought not thus to be set over against one another. They should be regarded as complementary or supplementary one to the other, one supplying for the total worship, at least in more completeness, what the other lacks.

The sermon brings the higher elements of human personality more fully into the worship than does, or can, the other parts of the worship. Men are commanded to love God with all their hearts, souls, and minds: that is, with their whole personalities. How can the fullness of what God means to human beings be brought more clearly to a group of people than through another human being? A man with mind, conscience, moral judgment and will; a man who can love, embody virtues in his character, be sensitive to moral values, and be moved with passion for social ideals; a man who can respond to truth, beauty, and goodness, whose personality is aglow with the Spirit of God—such a man is the highest symbol of God known. God is more like a human being than like any other “thing” in the universe. God can be conceived as a person nowhere else on this earth except in the mind of a man.

Not only is it impossible to eliminate the man from public worship, but it is unwise and dangerous to try to do so. The history of the Christian church shows that in the long run worship is kept spiritual and ethical

largely by sermons. The higher powers of one human personality must be brought into play in order to stir the higher powers of other human personalities to their noblest expression. God endowed man, and man alone of all his creatures, with the gift of articulate speech, with mechanisms to produce words, to listen to them and to respond to them. Mind affects mind, soul moves soul, conscience stirs conscience, ethical judgment and social passion stimulate those same things in others, through the medium of spoken words. Preaching is a necessary way for one person to explain and demonstrate to other persons what God means to men, what he requires and expects of them.

So preaching was central in Christianity from the start. And the church has suffered in every period of its history when preaching became of secondary importance. "Jesus came into Galilee preaching the gospel of God" (Mark 1:14).¹ He called and trained his apostles and sent them forth, saying, "Go . . . and preach as you go" (Matt. 10:5, 7). When the Christians were scattered because of persecution they "went about preaching the word" (Acts 8:4). The New Testament calls preaching "the ministry of the word," the proclamation of "the good news of Jesus" (Acts 8:35). God's redeeming work through Christ cannot get a chance with people until they are told about it. The very act of telling about it becomes an instrument of God's saving work.

Clearly this was the viewpoint of the New Testament writers. Paul told the Corinthians that he and his associates were "ambassadors for Christ, God making his appeal through us. We beseech you on behalf of Christ, be reconciled to God" (2 Cor. 5:20). That is, God was actually appealing to the people through the sermons of the early evangelists. Their preaching was, therefore, a continuation of the work of Christ. Paul said to the Thessalonians, "When you received the word of God which you heard from us, you accepted it not as the word of men but as what it really is, the word of God, which is at work in you believers" (1 Thess. 2:13). The early preachers were not proclaiming their own ideas but the word of God. Once accepted by the believers, that word became alive and active within them. Similarly, the sermon of the modern preacher becomes God's "saving approach to the souls of men," brings about a meeting between God and the hearers. When that takes place the highest possible act of worship takes place. John Watson once said the sermon is "the most critical and influential event in the religious week." That is equivalent to saying it is the high point of public worship.

¹ Bible quotations are from the Revised Standard Version.

J. R. P. Slater said a sermon may well be defined as "truth strained through a human personality." The gospel, as recorded in New Testament documents, is changeless. But it must be translated afresh into the language, the terminology, the mental concepts, and the experiences of every new generation. That translating is largely the responsibility and the function of the Christian preacher. *The gospel must be strained through his personality.* This means it must percolate through his mind, be assimilated into his thinking, translated into his experiences, and passed on in such manner through his sermons that the hearers will understand it, realize its relevance for them, and be persuaded to incorporate it in their common life.

Paul said something like that about preaching in an arresting passage in the second chapter of 1 Corinthians. He is talking about the wisdom of God unveiled in Christ, something never before dreamed of by the mind of man but hitherto kept hidden and secret. That wisdom, he says, can be understood only by those who have received the Spirit of God, for only the Spirit can comprehend the thoughts of God. But the Spirit who "searches everything, even the depths of God" has been given to Christians, making them spiritually minded, and therefore capable of understanding the amazing things God has bestowed upon men in Christ. Then, apparently speaking of those who proclaim the gospel, he goes on to say, "We impart this in words not taught by human wisdom but taught by the Spirit, interpreting spiritual truths to those who possess the Spirit" (v. 13). Then he makes the bold claim, "We have the mind of Christ" (v. 16). As startling as that may sound, it must be said that one main function of the sermon is to interpret to men the mind of God as it is revealed in the mind of Christ. The preacher is trying to bring about a meeting between Divine and human minds.

Austin Phelps defined a sermon as "an oral address to the popular mind, upon religious truth, contained in the Scriptures, and elaborately treated *with a view to persuasion.*" The preacher is not neutral. His avowed intention is to convince others, to persuade them to accept Christ. Tennyson said of one of the Knights of the Round Table, "He laid his mind on theirs and they believed in his beliefs." The preacher tries to lay the gospel, as it has been strained through his mind and heart, on the minds of the hearers in such way, and with such persuasive power, that they will believe in his beliefs. When he succeeds a supreme act of worship has occurred.

That is why the sermon occupies a central place in worship, and is peculiarly fitted to become the climax of the whole worship service. It is

capable of recapitulating the various moods and movements of the service, of drawing them together and focusing them upon the minds, the judgments, and the wills of the hearers. This is not only worship of the highest order but keeps the worship service from dissipating into mere emotions, or into "vain repetitions," or into mere formalities. The sermon presses for decisions, commitments, actions, deeds that prove one has had communion with God.

If any preacher questions whether the sermon is of supreme importance in public worship he should read and ponder the following statement of the purposes of preaching by Richard Baxter, the noted Puritan preacher of the seventeenth century:

What skill is necessary to make plain the truth, to convince the hearers; to let in the irresistible light into their consciences, and to keep it there, and drive all home; to screw the truth into their minds, and work Christ into their affections; to meet every objection that gainsays, and clearly to resolve it; to drive sinners to a stand, and make them see there is no hope, but they must unavoidably be converted or condemned; and to do all this for language and manner as beseems our work, and yet as is most suitable to the capacities of our hearers. This, and a great deal more that should be done in every sermon, should surely be done with a great deal of holy skill.²

THE SERMON BRINGS GROUP COUNSELING INTO WORSHIP

Earlier it was said that public worship is one important phase of a minister's pastoral activity. Let us now narrow that down somewhat by saying the sermon is a specialized form of pastoral counseling, a method of group spiritual therapy. In that respect also it plays a vital role in worship.

If the excerpts from the preaching of the early Christians found in the Book of Acts and the epistles of the Apostles to the early churches are an indication of what they preached about, then we may be sure many of their sermons took the form of pastoral counseling—although it is certain they didn't call it by that name. Ever since then, sermons have been the instrument of God for treating the psychological ills of men and women and restoring them to emotional health.

As the people in any modern parish come to believe in their pastor they will unveil their souls to him and seek his counsel. The dissipated, the desperate, the heroic and the cowardly, the well-adjusted and the ill-adjusted, the driven, the hopeless, the bored, the confused, the lonely, the disillusioned, the despondent, the handicapped, the troubled, the tempted, those who have lost and those who have never found their way,

² Baxter, R., *The Reformed Pastor*, New York, 1860, p. 75.

those who are trapped by their misdoings and tricked by their conflicting desires, the sinners and the outcasts—all these will look to him for help. Upon all of them he will look with pity, judgment, mercy, and love.

He will do what he can for them one by one. But there will be so many, with so many problems and he will have so little time, that he will soon realize he must counsel with them about their common problems in groups from his pulpit. Every problem he meets will suggest a possible sermon for its solution. The twisted notions, the gnarled emotions, the complexes, fears, worries, antipathies, prejudices, hostilities, suspicions, jealousies, sins, and a host of other inner problems of people will clamor for treatment weekly. Ideas for sermons will come trooping into his mind like a small army.

Charles Kingsley used to fold his arms, lean upon his pulpit, look his congregation in the eyes, and say, "Here we are again to talk about what is really going on in your soul and in mine." That sort of talking may properly be described as group pastoral counseling. No one who knows the history of Christian preaching at its best will belittle this type of counseling, or doubt that it is a valid worship experience. There have been some in recent years who have discounted its worth and advised preachers to cease their unscientific methods of pulpit therapy and to devote themselves primarily to counseling individuals. Ministers should never cease to counsel individuals, using all the help modern psychology and psychiatry can offer. But that is not a substitute for group counseling on Sunday. Each method has its own distinctive function to perform.

Interestingly enough, many professional psychiatrists, who have found the method of counseling with people one by one entirely too slow and too costly for themselves and their patients, are now using group therapy successfully. Bertrand S. Frohman, M.D., says the traditional method of prolonged treatment by endless hours of verbalizing is impossible for many patients and psychiatrists alike and also unnecessary in many cases. So he has devised a new method of "active psychotherapy" in which patients are given direct advice and emotional support when they need it. If necessary they are given a "psychological shock" that "catapults" them into solutions.³

This shift of emphasis on the part of psychiatrists is no surprise to many Christian preachers. For they do group counseling regularly from their pulpits with good results. They know that their sermons often produce divine "psychological shocks" that "catapult" people into decisions in

³ Frohman, B. S., *Brief Psychotherapy*, Philadelphia, Lea and Febiger, 1948, pp. 157ff.

which diseases of the soul are cured. Spiritual transformations, regenerations, and renewals take place consistently as the result of groups of people listening to preachers discuss their souls' illnesses. Sermons are God's instrument for making men and women new and whole in Christ. *The sermon is the most important single redemptive force of the week in every community where there are Christian churches.*

Every minister of the gospel would profit by framing the following estimate of the Sunday sermon by John Ruskin, placing it in a prominent place in his study, and reading it before he begins the preparation of each sermon:

That hour when men and women come in, breathless and weary with the week's labor, and a man "sent with a message," which is a matter of life and death, has but thirty minutes to get at the separate hearts of a thousand men, to convince them of all their weaknesses, to shame them for all their sins, to warn them of all their dangers, to try by this way and that to stir the hard fastenings of those doors, where the Master himself has stood and knocked, yet none opened, and to call at the opening of those dark streets, where Wisdom herself has stretched forth her hands and no man hath regarded,—thirty minutes to raise the dead in!—let us but once understand and feel this, and the pulpit will become a throne, like unto a marble rock in the desert, about which the people gather to slake their thirst.⁴

⁴ Quoted by Hillis, Newell D., in *Great Men as Prophets of a New Era*, Fleming H. Revell Co., 1922, pp. 212f.

From Reuel L. Howe

WHEN WE THINK about the ministry we are apt to do so in terms of its functions, and to ask, "What is the work of the ministry?" Our answer will point to its characteristic functions: priestly, pastoral, homiletical, and educational. We are rightly concerned about the adequate performance of these and the importance of acquiring the necessary skills. Seminaries are under constant demand to increase their "how-to-do-it" courses.

They are right to resist this demand. To give in to it would not only clutter up the curriculum but would also demonstrate a failure to understand the real problem, and consequently, its solution. An addition of courses in technique leads only to the necessity for the multiplication of such courses—an endless process. What is needed is a solution that will make possible a reduction in the number of "how-to-do-its." The clue to this solution is found in the other question about the ministry. The first one was "What are the functions of the ministry?" The second question is "What is its nature?" The question of "being" precedes the question of "function." In other words, behind the technique of function is the dynamic of the relationship of which the function is an expression. The question, "What shall I do and how shall I do it?" must be preceded by the questions "who," "for whom," "from whom," and "why?"

PERSONAL NATURE OF THE MINISTRY

Immediately, then, we approach our first observation about all ministry: Basically, it is personal and is concerned primarily with the encounter between person and person. Here care is needed to explain that ministry to "individuals" or "personal" ministry does not mean separating the individual from the fellowship upon which he must always depend. Nor does it mean that we have in mind a clergy-centered ministry. All ministry is to be understood as the whole ministry of laity as well as clergy, and to the whole church, to the individual in his indispensable relation to the group and to the group in its relation to the individual.

The personal nature of ministry derives (1) from the personal nature of life itself, and (2) from the personal nature of God's redemption. Men

REUEL L. HOWE, S.T.B., Th.M., S.T.D., is Professor of Pastoral Theology at the Protestant Episcopal Theological Seminary in Virginia, Alexandria, Virginia, and Consultant to The Department of Christian Education, Protestant Episcopal Church. He stresses the Ministry to Individuals, and shows the structure that is available for it.

are born into and realize the fullest meaning of their life from relationship with one another and God. A man can realize his personhood only by living in relation to persons. Access to a person can be had only through personal relationship, only through "real meeting" between persons. All ministry, if it is to reach the human soul, must first of all be personal. Professionalism is a sin because it is a contradiction of this first fundamental character of ministry. Second, God's redemption of man was his personal act incarnated in the person of Jesus, the Christ, and instrumentalized for our time in the new relationship brought into being by the Holy Spirit. *The dynamic behind all functions of the ministry is, therefore, the personal need of man and the personal act of God.* This understanding will be the basis of our study of the functions of the ministry.

The Christian ministry to individuals is significant in that a man cannot become a Christian by himself any more than he can become a person in isolation. We meet Christ in the Fellowship. And only by the Spirit which unites men to one another as well as to him can we call him Lord. This means that, as baptized members of the church, we are all ministers to one another. Every relationship is a potential means of revealing God to man and man to man. Every person is a potential instrument of God's salvation, and he is meant to be one in whom God and man, and man and man, meet in a saving relationship. The Scriptures show repeatedly that God speaks to men through men. His revelation of himself through Jesus of Nazareth and his creation of the new people show clearly his intention: that man shall both witness to and be the effective instrument of his saving love to one another.

Therefore, when a man comes to a minister for help, we may dare believe that through that meeting God and he will meet. The preacher, for example, as he proclaims the gospel, is the point of meeting between God and the congregation. Some may find this doctrine dangerous, but all Christian doctrine seems dangerous from a human point of view, and the more Christian it is, the more dangerous it may seem. (When a doctrine has lost its brave meaning it may have lost its Christian orientation.) Nor is this meaning of the role of the Christian ministry confined to the official ministry. All followers of Christ are ministers of him and, as such, instruments of his revelation in human relationship.

God, therefore, is the "from whom" or personal source of the ministry; the minister, whether clerical or lay, is the "who" or personal instrument of the ministry, and the people are the "to whom" or personal object of the ministry. On the basis of this understanding of the ministry, we begin to

see that the content of it is not only what the minister speaks out of the body of Christian knowledge and belief but also what happens in the ministering relationship. The Rev. Mr. J. could not understand why Jane and Bill were getting a divorce when he had instructed them so carefully in the meaning of Christian marriage. The difficulty may have been that he gave them only the subject matter about Christian marriage, and failed to help them understand themselves in relation to it. Here is a common mistake made by many pastors and teachers. They assume that they can determine the content of a pastoral or teaching relationship by choosing out of the store of propositions about Christian truth those parts which they think are applicable, and forcing them upon the people they are trying to teach. When this is done, they should not be surprised when the content has no redemptive effect upon the people.

THE CONTENT OF MINISTRY TO PERSONS

One of the important implications drawn from our observations thus far is that there are three sources of content of a ministry: (1) That originating from the person or persons who have occasioned the ministry by presenting a question, or problem, or need, or request; (2) that which originates from the minister, whose functions are affected in one way or another by his own problems and resources; and, (3) that which originates from God and his action on man's behalf, upon which both parishioner and pastor depend.

(1) The content of ministry which derives from the person seeking help consists of his problems and resources as they are tied together in him. When a couple comes to a premarital conference, they bring meanings for their marriage out of their respective backgrounds. Each brings his understandings of and feelings about marriage; each has capacities and incapacities of living with others; each brings his own fears and immaturities; each brings his own faith and power of being. These constitute a part of the content of the ministry that is to take place and should be so recognized and admitted to the "curriculum."

(2) Similarly, the minister himself brings meanings out of his background which constitute a part of the content of the ministry in which he is engaged. He needs to recognize this fact and make room for it. Wherein what he brings as a person is affirmative and helpful, all is well. Wherein his "content" is not helpful, he needs help in transcending it. For example, his own marriage may have been disappointing. Rather than let his bitterness or his wishful thinking give bias to the preparation of the couple before him,

he needs to incorporate its meaning into his ministry so that it becomes an asset and increases his understanding and power to help others. There the meaning of all his experience may become a part of the content of his ministry.

(3) The revelation of God's will and love for man is the part of the content that is generally recognized as such. It is the faith and practice of the Christian church and relevant to the needs of men.

Now these three parts of the content need to be integrated. The meanings of each—the man, the woman, and the minister—need to be judged, purified, completed and transformed by the meanings that come from God. The beginning of the integration of these parts of the ministry is the purpose of the counseling, and will take place in the personal encounter between the minister and the individuals he is counseling. God seeks to act through each, the boy and girl as well as the minister, in his relation to the others. Here are the "from whom," the "through whom," and the "for whom" parts of the ministry in redemptive interrelation.

And all together, in our mutual dependence and our mutual care of one another, we make up the church. In the context of this fellowship the ministry to the individual takes place by individuals who are also the beneficiaries of this same ministry. Thus we may think of the church as the redeemed people in constant need of redemption, and, at the same time, themselves instruments of that redemption.

Thus far we have described the ministry as being personal in nature and as taking place between man and man as God works through them. We need now to turn our attention to a consideration of the work of the ministry. When you listen to clergy talk about their work, you may easily get the impression of a sense of great clutter and lack of order. This is to be expected when you realize that a minister is one who is open to any demand of anybody at any time. He often finds himself being pulled from one emergency to another, with many demands of one kind or another in between. He is often without much sense of the interrelatedness of the things that he does. After a few years, he may become the victim of an orderless sense of demand and hurry. His condition suggests a great need for a structure in which the purpose and meaning of the ministry might be realized.

A STRUCTURE FOR MINISTRY

A natural inherent structure is available for our purpose. It is to be discerned in the life of the individual and is to be accepted as a guide in

understanding and directing our ministry to individuals. The structure for our work that I have in mind is based on the common ventures of birth, growth, maturity, mating, parenthood, of sickness, of bereavement and death. They are the turning points through which every living person must either pass or, in the avoidance of some of them, must make alternate decisions and adjustments. These crucial events in individual history are occasions when the individual's questions about life are either raised or sharpened. They are likewise occasions when the individual is apt to become more acutely aware of his needs and is, therefore, more open to effective help. These crucial events in individual history are, of course, well known. Their significance for the ministry and the advantage of building a ministry around them, however, is not so well known. Let us look at each of these experiences as a basis for understanding the nature of the ministry.

1. *The event of birth and the ministry to individuals.* Each man has a twofold relationship to the experience of birth. The first has to do with his own birth and the questions it raises for him. The second has to do with the birth of others. Here his most significant concern is the birth of his children. We cannot assume that men consistently feel that it is good to be alive, or that they feel good about the birth of others. That we have mixed feelings about our existence is seen in the fact that we both seek for survival and yet live in ways that accomplish an impairment, if not a destruction, of our living. Hope for life and despair of life are mixed in our breast. And a great question that emerges out of this condition is the question, "Who am I?"

Here is an urgent question that demands an answer. Because death is such an irreconcilable contradiction of birth, men protest the finitude of their existence. And because something in them alienates the relationship for which they sense they were made, and are, therefore, denied the fulfillment for which they yearn, they are in despair over the reason for their existence, and so they cry, "What is man?" "Who am I?" The gospel is addressed to this condition: "See what love the Father has given us, that we should be called children of God; and so we are" (1 John 3:1, RSV). This is really the Christian answer to the needs of men, yet they cannot understand it as long as it remains an abstraction. The concept "child of God" is meaningless until we understand its meaning in terms of the meaning of our despair about who we are. Therefore, the preaching, teaching, and pastoral ministry to individuals should always be sharply focused on this question.

It is profoundly significant that Baptism, one of the two most generally accepted Christian sacraments, enacts sacramentally the answer to man's

question, "Who am I?" It is the sacrament of initiation. By it we enter the new relationship that we have with God in Christ, through which we know ourselves to be the children of God and his people. Not only is Baptism the basis of our new relationship, but more specifically it initiates the relationship in which the ministry to individuals is carried on, whether it be carried on by the official ministry or by the lay ministry.

2. *The event of growth and the ministry to individuals.* The second experience of the individual on the road of life is the experience of growth. Although we want to avoid the modern tendency to look for problems where they do not exist, we also do not want to assume that human growth takes place automatically and without spiritual danger. From the beginning of life to its end, and at varying paces, there is growth or the possibility of growth. To a certain extent the human being shares with the rest of creation the unfolding character of growth which proceeds from inherent patterns. Unlike the rest of creation, however, the human being grows in relation to experiences about which he must make decisions. These decisions determine in large measure whether there is progress or regress; whether the human being moves forward in his course or stands still. The purpose of growth for man is to become what he is; to know the full meaning of his existence; to draw the most from life. And the great question that represents the deep concern of growth is, "How shall I realize what I am?" Christian education has the responsibility of helping man to find the answer to this question.

We have already seen that the Christian answer to the question, "Who am I?" is, "You are a child of God." The answer to the second question, "How shall I realize what I am?" namely a child of God, is, "By living in relation to God." But how can a little baby or a young child or an adolescent or even an older person live in relation to God and come, therefore, to know himself as a child of God? God himself has given us the answer in his people. As the people of God embody in their daily relationship with their children the belief that they are the children of God, the children will come to know themselves as God's. Christian education in common with all education employs two languages. In chronological order one precedes the other. The first is what I have called the "language of relationship." That is, meanings are conveyed by the way in which we live with one another. A child whose experiences grow out of the natural affection of the parent for him and also out of the conviction that he is a child of God and, therefore, the object of God's amazing love, is being prepared for the realization that he is God's own child. Because of the meanings he brings out of this kind

of an experience he will be better able to understand the meanings of the formal words about God and his action for him in Christ by means of which he was reconciled and reunited to God. This dual language of Christian teaching, namely the language of relation and the language of words, is no less needed by the adult world than the child world.

One of the minister's functions is so to conceive Christian education, and to train his people so to live and speak to all men everywhere, that they will come to know themselves as the children of God and, therefore, receive an answer to their question, "How shall I realize what I am?"

3. *The event of maturity and the ministry to individuals.* Maturity, of course, does not take place all at once, but there is a time of transition from what we might call the filial to the parental role; from a state in which dependence is prominent to one in which independence is most characteristic. Adolescence is this time of transition; a time when the individual begins to assume responsibility for his own life; when he gradually becomes his own authority and outgrows the old parent-child relationship; when he comes into his sexual maturity which prepares him to take his own mate and himself become a parent; and when he begins to think about his vocation. Also it is a time when he is ready to make those assents and commitments that determine his ultimate relationships and values—whom he will worship and serve.

Obviously this is a crucial time. The great, deep question that grows out of it is, "What shall I do with my life? How shall I carry out my responsibilities? How shall I use my functions? What purpose shall I serve?" Of course, these questions are not asked only in adolescence. We continue to ask them all our lives, but they have a crucial character during this transition period.

Now this situation with its questions provides a point of focus for the work of the minister in relation to individuals. He will have opportunity to help parents and children wean themselves from the old dependent relationships. He will need to provide Christian interpretation for the meaning of sex and marriage. He will want to help his young people decide what they are going to do with their lives. They are really making decisions that are in the nature of commitments to a faith and way of life. Are we going to let these youngsters make such important decisions piecemeal and relatively, or are we going to give them a comprehensive and saving context in which to make them?

In other words, this is a time when we should be bringing to focus all their previous training to an understanding of the major issues of life in

relation to their need of Jesus Christ as their Savior. The Christian answer to the question, "What shall I do with my life?" is, "Give it away." This may seem like hard counsel to give to young people who have just come into possession of their life, as it were. But it is Christian teaching, whether we like it or not. The only way in which we can find our life is to lose it, and the most creative way to lose it is to give it to Him, who alone can save us from destroying that which we treasure.

So the minister in his care of individuals will during this time seek to prepare and bring his young people to Confirmation, if this is the practice of his Church; or to some other kind of definite commitment of his life to God in the life of the people of God.

4. *The event of marriage and the ministry to individuals.* Here we come to an event that is significant because in it men and women seek one another in order to complete their being. In this relationship more than in any other they may enter more deeply into the meaning of the experience of loving and being loved. In a relationship with one another, men and women look for love and its fulfillment. Marriage is a doorway through which most people pass happily and with great expectation, but great is the possibility of disappointment and despair. Marriage is a relationship that may be a means of grace or a means of destruction. Because men and women enter into marriage prompted by some kind of feeling of love and looking for love with great expectation, the occasion is one that provides a magnificent opportunity to understand perhaps for the first time the relevance of the gospel and their need of a Savior. Most couples enter into it trying to believe in love, and are asking the question, "How can we realize all that this relationship seems to promise?"

The Christian answer is in two parts: (1) Human love has power, but its power is not equal to the demands of their relationship because of the self-centered sinfulness of human love; and, (2) The full and true reunion with one another, and therefore the realization of the promise of their relationship, is to be found in Christ who triumphed over the self-love that always separates and alienates us from one another. With a due respect for the limitations and resources of *eros* and a dependence upon *agape*, they will be able to face and work through the difficulties they will encounter on the way and achieve an enduring and deepening relationship. The role of a man and woman in Christian marriage is to call one another into being both as man and woman and as husband and wife. Their happiness and fulfillment may not be without the experience of doubt, anxiety, and suffering. True peace

and love are not to be found by evading conflict but by facing it and working through it.

This is the task of the ministry at this point in the case of individuals. It means teaching and preaching about the Christian meaning of sex and marriage; it means preparing young people for marriage; it means helping people who are already married with their doubts and fears and difficulties of one kind or another; and it means also being concerned about everything in our culture that corrupts and prevents people from understanding and achieving Christian marriage.

5. *The experience of parenthood* is another occasion for ministry to individuals. Here again we are concerned with the beginnings of life, because now we have an opportunity to help lay the foundations of a new life. The minister who has an understanding of what is involved in the experience of expectation, birth, and the subsequent adjustments may exercise a powerful ministry. Many people sense, as perhaps they have not at any other time, an intimate relationship between their own function and the function of God. As never before, they may be caught up in the wonder and the mystery of life. And perhaps at no other time do they ask the questions that they do now: "What is the meaning of life? Is it right to bring children into the world at this time? Knowing myself as I do, what right have I to assume the responsibility for another? How can I be equal to the relationship that my child will bring?" Then there are the people who say: "I'm not going to let my child make any difference in my life. Why should I bother? I've been pushed around, why shouldn't he?" Then there are those who resent their parental role and who ask: "Why did I get caught? How can I get out of this responsibility?" Every kind of person and every kind of question presents the minister with an opportunity to help, because each kind of question represents a real need and, as such, gives him access to the person who asks the question.

The Christian answer is that life is dependent on love. God is Love. Because we bear his image, we need love to live. First, we need to be loved; second, we need to love. In the beginning of individual life our chief need is to be loved. This is the need of the new baby. But as we grow up we acquire the need to love, without of course losing the need to be loved. This is the need of the parent. So both the infant and the parents will prosper if the relationship is the fruit of love.

But it is not easy to love, and sometimes it is harder than others; especially if the baby's demands for love keep us from other interests that

make less demand on us. The minister will be able to help his people through understanding and acceptance, through teaching and visiting, through prayer and counseling and other means, to assume the wonderful and yet terrible parental responsibilities with the helps that come from the Divine Parent. Little by little he may be able to draw them more and more into an attitude of thanksgiving for their children; thanksgiving that they may share in the role of divine parenthood; thanksgiving that they may participate not only in the creative role, but also be the instrument of God's love to their children.

6. *The experiences of illness and the ministry to individuals.* The diseases of a man's body which often drag down his spirit and disturb his relationships, and the anxieties of his spirit which enfeeble his body and distort his relationships, and the hostilities of his relationships which hurt the spirit and destroy his body, are all symptoms of both his finitude and sin. Sickness is a witness to our vulnerability. If sickness is not the result of anxiety, it causes anxiety, which can so easily result in more sickness. Some of our anxiety is normal to human existence. We need faith and courage to enable us to take its threat and pain into ourselves, which in the end saves us from the destructive effect of our normal anxieties. But our anxieties become abnormal and sick when we run away from them and from life.

Christ's answer to the sick, "Thy faith hath made thee whole," suggests the question that man out of his sickness asks: "Where can I find again the lost source of my full life?" or "Where is the relationship that will restore me to the source of wholeness?" Most of the time, the sick man does not know that he is asking such questions, but the minister, if he understands the depth meaning of illness, may be able to help him to recognize the meaning of his experience, the nature of his need, and the relevance and availability of what God has done for him. As a result the experience of illness may become for him an occasion for reconciliation and reunion, rather than remaining a destructive misfortune. To be grasped by God and the healing of his love is to be renewed at one's spiritual center. This renewal may result in remission of symptoms, and it may not. But remission of symptoms is not of primary importance. The important thing is the reunion, the renewal, and the victory over the anxiety that destroys.

The ministry to the individual in times of sickness, therefore, is a ministry of helping people to respond to sickness by opening themselves to the reuniting relationship with God.

7. *Bereavement and burial of the dead* are the final crises through which the individual passes. And here is another opportunity the minister

has to meet the needs of the individual with the help of the gospel.

Both our experiences of bereavement and the approach of our own death raise the same question, "Is this all?" Our very nature finds death, whether our own or that of others, intolerable, and we protest it. And the brevity of life is not our only concern. Even more important is the quality of life. The common observation, "We have only one life to live and we have to make the most of it," suggests that the average man's concern is to drink deeply as well as lastingly of the best of life. Whether they know it or not, people are looking for the completion and the fulfillment of the good they know, and for deliverance from the evil that destroys them. Even while they pursue a way of life that will destroy them, they yearn for the way of victory. They seek blindly and rebelliously for the secret of life, even though they often reject and corrupt it when they find it. And so they cry out of what they know and have, "Is this all?"

The answer of Christ is "No, that is not all. 'I am the resurrection and the life, saith the Lord; he that believeth in me, though he were dead, yet shall he live; and whosoever liveth and believeth in me shall never die.'" Out of this answer we minister to individuals.

The answer to the threat of death is in the realization of life. Holy living makes for holy dying. If we consent to be buried with Christ in his death, we shall be partakers of his resurrection, now in this life as well as hereafter. This is the meaning of Baptism which initiates us into the Christian life. That life accepts the principle that only by losing our life for Christ's sake will we find it. Self-realization, which is our greatest concern, is not to be found through self-enjoyment and cultivation but by self-giving and disciplining.

The ministry that is to help individuals to know Christian victory over sin and finally death is a ministry to the whole life of the individual. Everything may contribute to training in Christian living. The ministry as we have discussed it here is the process through which people come to possess within themselves God's final answer to the meaning of their life.

CONCLUSION

Such is the structure for the ministry to individuals as we find it inherent in the life of people. So much of the ministry—priestly, homiletical, educational, and pastoral—centers directly or indirectly in those events in human life. They are all opportunities to proclaim the gospel of Christ and

to win men to him because the need of men and the action of God are more readily seen in relation to each other. This structure makes possible a correlation of the functions of the ministry. Thus to prepare a couple for marriage brings into correlative function the pastor's concern for them as people; the teacher's concern for the faith; the missionary's concern to bring them into saving relationship; and the priest's concern that the sacramental grace be available. Each minister may be saved from the fragmenting effect of thinking of himself as a teacher at one time, a preacher at another, and a pastor at another. Instead he may have the healing and integrating benefit of knowing himself as an instrument of God's redemption. As such he is a priest and a teacher, and a missionary when he is a pastor. Each function always bears the responsibility of the others because of the unity of God's action.

From James D. Smart

I

THREE IS NOT USUALLY any need of argument to convince ministers that they have responsibility for preaching and sacraments, for pastoral care, and for the administration of the affairs of their congregations. But the situation is very different when the subject of education is raised. Every minister would be likely to admit the importance of education in the church, but on the question whether or not he himself should have any major responsibility in it there would be vigorous argument. Most ministers do not consider education an integral part of their ministry, parallel with preaching, administering the sacraments, and pastoral care. It is something added. They may perform the duties of their ministry without participating in it. They think of themselves as preachers and pastors and not as teachers.

A number of factors have contributed to this situation. First is the prevalence of the idea that the Sunday School is peculiarly the responsibility of the lay leaders within the church. In its inception in the eighteenth century the Sunday School movement was in a very large measure a laymen's venture, and the antagonism of many of the clergy to it tended to fasten this character upon it even more securely. This tradition has persisted down to the present day, and in many congregations it is assumed without discussion that the minister should leave the Sunday School entirely under the direction of the men and women who are in charge of it. He may attend and participate, may even teach a class, but he is not expected to do more than this. Attempts to make any radical changes in the school may be resented as interference.

Second is the pressure of varied duties upon the modern minister, which makes him glad to be relieved of responsibility wherever possible. But, curiously, he is so eager to be rid of educational responsibility that he will hand it over to a person who has neither competence nor training to direct an educational program but only good character and enthusiasm. He would not let himself be relieved in a similar way of his responsibility for preaching,

JAMES D. SMART, M.A., Ph.D., was Editor-in-chief of *The New Curriculum*, for the Board of Christian Education of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. Previously he was a parish minister in Canada, and is now Minister of the Rosedale Presbyterian Church, Toronto, Canada. He writes now on "The Minister as Educator."

administering the sacraments, or visiting people in sickness and spiritual need.

Third is the development in the past half century of a special educational ministry, which has rarely in the churches achieved equal status with the preaching and pastoral ministry. The idea has gone abroad that these are two separate ministries and that one must choose between them. One chooses to be either a preacher and pastor or an educator. But a high percentage of churches are able to maintain only one person in their ministry, and if this person conceives himself as preacher and pastor alone, the educational side of the church's life is likely to receive little attention from him.

Perhaps also we have been influenced by the modern trend toward specialization. In medicine the field of knowledge has become so vast that mastery is regarded as possible only in some one portion of the field. The general practitioner who attempts to treat the whole range of human disease falls into the shadow and, inconvenient as it may be to the patient to have several doctors instead of one, an army of specialists takes over. But is the ministry, which has to do with the whole life of man from the cradle to the grave, any less complex than the task of the doctor? Or any less important?

It is not surprising, therefore, to hear the proposal that, in order to gain a higher measure of efficiency in the ministry, a policy of specialization should be encouraged. It is too much for one man to be preacher, counselor, administrator, educator. It is a full-time task to prepare and preach sermons that are abreast of modern knowledge and are biblically and theologically competent. The counselor has to master the sources of his knowledge not only in the Christian faith but also in psychology and psychiatry. The educator should command the whole field of modern educational research and practice. Recently in *The Christian Century* one writer expressed the conviction that so complex has the minister's task become that the wisest policy would be to replace a number of smaller congregations with one large central institutional church which would be able to afford a panel of specialists in the various Christian ministries. Under the influence of this way of thinking, ministers begin to feel that they cannot be expected to carry any educational responsibility; in fact they are likely to feel that even pastoral responsibility is an imposition if they are taking the work of preaching seriously.

All of this has an effect upon the character of the work done in our theological seminaries. If a large number of the men in training feel that they are called to a preaching, or a preaching and pastoral ministry, but not to a teaching ministry, and if the staff of the seminary in general accepts this

distinction, then the seminary is likely to graduate such men with little competence for and little interest in the whole educational work of the local church.

II

It may be healthy, then, for us to remind ourselves that the Christian ministry is a continuation of the ministry of Jesus Christ and of his apostles. In the New Testament, the twelve, and later the seventy, were commissioned to do what Jesus himself was doing. Their mission was an expansion of his mission. The power of the keys committed to them was simply the power to speak the same word by means of which Jesus opened the kingdom of heaven to those who were ready and at the same time confronted the unready with a closed door. The disciples were to be the light of the world even as he was the light of the world. They were to have power to forgive sins even as he had power to forgive sins. It was nothing less than the ministry of Jesus that they were invited to share.

But, before they could share his ministry, they had to share his very being. Jesus drew the disciples, in spite of their sin and ignorance, into a oneness with himself in which the life that he had in fellowship with God became their life. The love of God that dwelt in him and had in it an infinite mercy came also to dwell in them. The Spirit of God, which possessed him wholly, took possession also of them and empowered them for the life and mission to which he called them.

Paul's entire conception of the ministry is governed by this same principle of unity with Jesus Christ. When he speaks of "being in Christ" and of "Christ living in him," the terms do not signify merely an inner mystical experience, as some interpreters have surmised. The mystical experience may well have been present, but, for Paul, oneness with Christ was primarily oneness with him in his ministry. For Christ to live in him meant that the ministry of Jesus Christ was actually being reproduced in him so that through him, Paul, the same salvation was reaching men which Jesus had effected in his life and death and resurrection. The same conception lies behind Paul's doctrine of the Church as the body of Christ. It is a living body only insofar as Jesus Christ himself dwells in it and uses it to continue the redemption of the human race.

The church, therefore, is not free to make of its ministry whatever it may choose or whatever may seem expedient in a particular situation. The constant temptation of the church is to let itself be drawn by the pressures of society and by what seem to be the urgencies of the contemporary situation

into a partial abandonment of its original character. Thus it becomes the bulwark of civilization, the custodian of the higher values in a national way of life, the chief support of moral standards in a particular society, the expression of man's higher cultural and spiritual interests, and its redemptive ministry is lost from sight. The church has indispensable services to perform toward civilization, the nation, the order of society and the cultural life of the community, but first it must establish the primary character of its ministry in continuity with Jesus Christ and the apostles.

Those who are inclined to talk glibly of the Christian ministry being too complex to be discharged by one person will do well to consider what it was in its origin. Jesus was preacher, teacher, and pastor. We might also say that he was the equivalent of a seminary professor, for much of his time was spent in training the twelve, and later the seventy, for their ministry. It is in Paul that we see the apostolic ministry most clearly exemplified, and again we recognize the varied functions of preacher, teacher, pastor, organizer of churches, author, trainer of ministers. What interests us most at present, however, is that teaching occupied a place of great importance in both ministries.

Sometimes a false distinction has been made between preaching and teaching in the New Testament, preaching being defined as proclamation of the gospel and teaching as chiefly moral instruction. This is a postbiblical distinction that destroys the unity of the two as we find them in the New Testament. There it is always the same gospel that is preached and is taught.

The teaching ministry at the beginning had to do with the training of new converts rather than with the education of children. It was not sufficient for men to receive the gospel with repentance and faith. The believer was committed not just to a new belief and to a new way of life but also to a life of discipleship in which he would live and act as a responsible participant in a redemptive mission. For this he needed thorough training. He needed to hear with much greater clearness and fullness the gospel by means of which his new life had opened to him. He needed to make the transition from his old inadequate and false ideas to a Christian understanding of God and man and all things in life. But he needed also to be equipped to take his place as a spokesman of the gospel in a world that would contradict it at every point.

It is little wonder, then, that teaching occupied so important a place in the early church, that the apostles considered themselves teachers as well

as preachers, and that some men had to be assigned specially to the work of teaching. As thousands of converts flooded into the church, coming from both Jewish and Gentile backgrounds, the work of teaching had to be done thoroughly if these new members were to be emancipated from their Jewish and Greek conceptions and were to find their way through to a truly Christian order of life. Many of the difficulties and heresies of the first centuries were the result of incompleteness in this process of re-education.

III

Education with us takes place in a different situation. Its primary concern is not with converts but with children who have been reared mainly in the homes of church members. But we are under a serious delusion if we think that that makes the task easier. With the convert from an avowedly non-Christian world the problems are out in the open and can be approached with directness and despatch. But with children, young people, and adults who have grown up, or are growing up, straddling between two worlds, the one Christian and the other pagan but with its paganism dissembled, there is a confusion in the atmosphere that makes the work of education difficult at every step.

The fatal error is to assume that the members of our churches, together with their children, are Christians who need only moral improvement. They seem like such fine people, such good Christians already, and with such splendid children, that it would be almost insulting to them to suggest that they need a thorough re-education into the Christian faith! It would be far closer to the mark, however, to assume that the majority of our people are not too clear in their minds what the Christian faith really is, that they have great difficulty in seeing the difference between Christian principles and certain popular ideologies that are current in their world, that the root of many of their practical problems lies in the vagueness of their comprehension of what it is to live by faith in Jesus Christ, that they are lost when they open a Bible, and that they have never thought of their membership in the church as committing them to a life of active discipleship. Apparently the task of training Christians to take their share in the Christian mission is as urgent today as it was in the early church.

Preaching is the proclamation of the gospel to all men, Christians and non-Christians, in their unbelief, calling them to repentance and faith. Teaching is the process by which we continue to open the truth of the gospel to those who have responded in faith, leading them step by step toward a

fuller comprehension of its foundations in Scripture, its orderly statement in the doctrines of the church, its practical consequences in the history of the church, and its implications for the entire range of human conduct.

Where there is preaching without teaching, Christians are likely to be arrested in their development. They respond in repentance and faith but they do not receive an education in the Scriptures that makes them able to find the word of God in them for themselves, or a grasp of Christian doctrine that would give their faith more definite and coherent form, or a knowledge of church history that would enable them to see the problems of the church today against the background of the experience of the past. In short, a congregation which has only a preaching ministry and not a teaching ministry as well is likely to remain little more than an audience for a preacher instead of becoming a fellowship of disciples, each with his ministry to fulfill and each in training for a fuller and more effective discharge of his ministry.

Equally unfortunate for the church is neglect of the preaching ministry by a man who has become so enthused about a teaching ministry that he makes it his entire concern. Teaching divorced from preaching is always in danger of becoming purely intellectual and moral in its concern and of losing the kerygmatic quality without which it cannot be Christian. In teaching as in preaching our ultimate problem is the sin and unbelief in human life that are the resistance of the human self to God and are overcome only when God himself comes in judgment and in mercy to each person through the word of the gospel. A preference for what is thought to be a teaching ministry may in reality be an evasion of that awesome prophetic and apostolic responsibility of speaking God's own word to man in his sin and unbelief.

Where, then, does a minister do his teaching? There is no reason why he cannot in one and the same sermon be both preaching and teaching. This is particularly true if he makes a practice of expository preaching, taking seriously that he is minister of the Word which is to be heard in the Scriptures and not merely "minister of truth in general." The sermon which deals faithfully with a passage of Scripture, considering it in its context and letting it speak its own message with clarity, becomes the means not only of letting God's call to repentance and a new life sound in men's ears but also of training them in sound methods of interpreting the Scriptures for themselves. The great loss in topical preaching is that, while it may produce a vivid impression for the moment, it does little to equip the believer to explore the sources of Christian truth and life for himself.

There is no reason, either, why whole books of Scripture cannot be made the subjects of sermons. By introducing the books to his people and giving some guidance how to get at the peculiar message of each of them, a minister may well encourage a much wider and more intelligent use of Scripture. There are many earnest Christians who never go beyond the psalms and the gospels in their reading of Scripture, because no one has ever shown them how to interpret the other books. A series of sermons on a prophet such as Jeremiah can not only open the book of Jeremiah to them but can also provide them with an approach to the prophets in general that enables them to make sense of other prophetic literature.

Sermons on doctrine will naturally be biblical sermons since each Christian doctrine is rooted in Scripture. And even when we deal with church history we find ourselves never far from the Scriptures, since we begin with the centuries of the Old and New Testament church and, as we go on from there to consider the developments of succeeding centuries, are constantly bringing them to the test of whether or not they are a valid continuation of the biblical church. The history of the church is actually a living commentary on the message of the Scriptures.

Where there are still morning and evening services on a Sunday, the evening may profitably be devoted to a more distinctively teaching ministry. But beyond the range of Sunday services the minister should have some provision in his week for gathering people in a more informal situation for the study of such subjects as have been outlined. He himself needs intimate contact with thoughtful minds from among his people that he may be made more sharply conscious of where they find their problems, and in a smaller group he will be able to make his resources of knowledge more directly available to them at their points of need. Here he can train teachers and leaders, guiding them into that deeper understanding of their faith that makes possible a more intelligent Christian service.

The pastoral ministry can also in some measure be a teaching ministry. Almost invariably the person who comes to the minister with some critical spiritual problem is deficient in his understanding of the Christian gospel. Instead of trying to give him a ready remedy, we should point out to him the depth of his problem and persuade him to begin, under our guidance, a study of what the Christian faith is and what it can mean to him in his situation. Invariably one discovers in people who are wrestling with particularly thorny problems within themselves and who seek the help of a minister, that the problem is rooted in their failure to grow in spiritual life.

beyond the capacities and understandings of childhood. For some reason their development has been arrested. Their conception of the Christian faith is that of an adolescent. They have never gone beyond their childhood prayers. And the spiritual equipment of childhood and adolescence is not adequate to meet the problems of adult life. The minister therefore needs to take them back to where they left off, that they may pick up afresh their education in the Christian faith.

Also, in the visitation of people in their homes, there is rarely need for the conversation to remain on a superficial level. If the minister is himself interested and open toward it, he will quite often be given the opportunity to discuss matters of real Christian import. The decisive factor is whether or not the minister considers himself to be a teacher, has undergone the disciplines that will fit him for the task, and so thinks of his ministry in all its aspects as a teaching as well as a preaching and pastoral ministry.

What the Layman Expects From His Minister

J. STANFORD SMITH

WHEN I WAS ASKED to speak on "what a layman should expect from his minister," I could not help feeling that it was a strange subject to assign a Methodist layman. After all, I had always assumed that the safest thing for a Methodist to expect in his minister is whatever the bishop sends him.

So I decided to consult the chairman of the "pulpit study committee" of a neighboring church which had been spending ten months searching for a new pastor. "What," I asked him, "do you expect from a minister?" His answer well reflects the complexity and scope of a Protestant minister's responsibilities:

"Our twenty-man committee doesn't quite realize it," he said, "but from our meetings I'm sure that to satisfy us fully a minister must be an outstanding speaker, skilled teacher, master politician, musical expert, trained psychologist, athletic director, funeral director, building expert, natural-born leader, and top-notch business executive, who is an expert in budgets . . ." At that point I interrupted, "If you find this fellow I think you ought to run him for President."

"Oh," he went on, "that's not all. He must be a man of rare spiritual insight, a person who has faith and ability to transmit that faith to others. He must be old enough to command respect, but young enough to fit right in with our young married group. Naturally, we expect him to be well educated, well dressed, and to take part in all community affairs. The same thing goes for his family, because you understand that his wife must be a real leader in church affairs. As the very minimum, she ought to be a devoted mother, a gifted musician, a good cook, a fine Sunday-school teacher, and, above all, an Emily Post at the tea table."

His comments, facetious though they were, give a reasonably accurate

J. STANFORD SMITH is Manager of General Public Relations for the General Electric Company, 570 Lexington Avenue, New York City. As a prominent layman he delivered this address at the 1954 Buck Hills Falls Conference of Ministers of the New York Area, The Methodist Church. It is also available in pamphlet form, from Rev. A. Gordon Archibald, 60 Elmwood Place, Newburgh, New York.

picture as to what the layman seems to expect from his minister. But certainly such a melange of great expectations does not provide a profitable approach for our discussion, so I shall group my remarks under five major headings. While some of my examples may be taken from a reasonably large church, the principles involved are applicable in any size of congregation.

I. MORAL AND ETHICAL LEADERSHIP

First, I think the layman has a right to expect moral and ethical leadership from his minister. I well realize that the charge is often made that laymen do not want such moral leadership, that they want the preacher to confirm their prejudices, to endorse the status quo, and to say only the things that they want to hear. My answer to that charge is that I don't believe it. I do not believe that the average layman has respect for a reed swaying in the wind; rather he is looking for a minister who truly stands for something, knows what he stands for, and does not hesitate to speak out for it.

In one of the large cities in our country, a little girl started to public school in kindergarten. Her mother would take her to class every morning, but she could find the way home by herself because she lived next door to a church. By looking up over the treetops as she left school, she could see the steeple and follow it home. One day she happened to leave school by a different door than usual. A few minutes later her teacher found her outside weeping bitterly. When asked what was wrong, she stammered through her tears to explain, "I have lost the steeple!"

Though he may not phrase his expectation in words, the layman expects the minister to provide the steeple of moral leadership. As a business executive said recently in a discussion about the church, "Sometimes my minister annoys the devil out of me . . . but when I think about it, I realize that's what he's there for." I don't mean to suggest that moral leadership always involves annoying, although I think there may be a portion of it that must be done that way.

The minister's interest in ethical problems can result in significant lay leadership in this field. I know an adult church-school class that selected "Christian Ethics at Work" as their discussion topic for the year. Each week the class explored the ethics of some vocation or function of daily life. They examined the ethics of law, of teaching, of selling, of journalism, of advertising, of engineering, of consumer buying, of organized charity. Most important, they did not try to discuss them secondhand. In every

case, they invited the leader in that function in the community to participate.

The city manager discussed the ethics of government; the president of the Chamber of Commerce discussed retail selling; a college president one week and the superintendent of schools the next, reviewed the ethics of education. An engineering executive, a union leader, a sales manager, an advertising manager, a newspaper editor—these are just a few of the community leaders who took part. Afterward many of the men said, "Appearing before your class caused me to think through the activities in which I am engaged day by day. I discussed them with my associates; we have made some changes."

That is ethical leadership at work. It is a pattern that could be repeated in any community. I think I should point out that out of the thirty-nine community leaders who were invited to lead these thirty-nine sessions, every single one accepted. Yet I sometimes hear ministers who say that they cannot get laymen to participate. "Zacchaeus, come down out of that tree; I am going home to dinner with you!" It is as simple as that, because if we approach our fellow men on the things that touch their daily lives, they are vitally interested in the subject of religion.

Another aspect of moral leadership is the maintenance of full freedom of expression. The free pulpit, the free mind, and the questing spirit are at the very roots of our religion and our democratic system of government. I have become increasingly convinced that all of our freedoms are interrelated—our political freedom, our religious freedom, our academic freedom, our freedom of inquiry, our economic freedom. The businessman who is indifferent to political freedom or academic freedom cannot expect long to maintain the economic freedom that he seeks. The professor who scoffs at economic freedom undermines his right to academic freedom, and a preacher would indeed be shortsighted if he were interested only in the freedom of religion.

It is the man who holds fast to a principle, who is determined to see it through, come what may, who has been the tonic of the ages. When they think it through, most laymen know it. I am not counseling the blatant bravado that can create nothing but controversy, but rather the calm assurance in regard to this freedom which says, "Here I stand, God help me; I can do none other."

There is a laboratory device known as the recording spectrophotometer into which you feed a sample of paint or paper or fabric in order to plot its exact color. The machine measures the color of the sample by comparing it with a constant white light. The white light of the church is the constant

factor against which the many-hued fabrics of our daily lives must be compared. The layman looks to the minister to provide the ethical leadership which helps him to make such moral judgments.

II. INTELLECTUAL STIMULATION

Second, I think the layman has a right to look to the minister for intellectual stimulation. Moral leadership is not enough. The minister must help every man to forge his own faith. To make steel that can stand up under years of stress, it must be refined with fire to burn out the impurities and then put under a forge and pounded unmercifully. After that is done, we have a piece of steel that can stand repeated blows or that can revolve for fifty years faster than the speed of sound without coming apart. But if the metal is not subjected to the fire and to the pounding, you have cast iron, and a single blow can crack it or smash it to pieces. So it is with a man's faith.

Last Student Recognition Sunday, our church had about forty-five students together from all over the United States. At a breakfast discussion we asked them how the church could better equip young men and women to stand up under the stresses that college life brings. Several of them told us about young men and women who had come to their college campuses with a crystallized faith—one which had been exactly formed, and carefully preserved. The first blows of college life had shattered their faith like a pane of glass into millions of pieces that could never be put together again.

I remembered a young man back in Indiana who had won all sorts of prizes for reciting Bible verses. Those were the days of stars and medals and so on, you know. But he went away to college and, after just one semester, he came back scoffing at the Bible and all that it contains. "Why," he said, "the story of Jonah and the whale couldn't possibly be true because the hydrochloric acid in the whale's stomach would have eaten the skin off of him in forty-five minutes." He has never gone back to the church since that time, except when his high-school daughter is scheduled to sing a solo in the choir. You see, his faith had not been forged in such a way that it could stand up under the impact of the new experiences that college brought.

Part of the job of intellectual stimulation is to light the fires of doubt and to subject our young people to all sorts of opinions and points of view, because our faith is an anvil that has worn out many a hammer. How can we be so shallow as to think that our puny minds can find doubts enough to destroy the essentials of Christian faith intelligently presented?

As a part of this matter of intellectual stimulation, I list great preaching. The need for great preaching is greater than ever. I remember how my father used to take the five youngsters in our family to watch every holiday parade. We would follow the parade to the park, and while we went off to try the chutes and swings, Father would sit and listen to two hours of patriotic oratory and enjoy every word of it. Then came the radio, and since he could hear the best speakers from all over the country, holiday speeches in the park were no longer of interest.

Now we have television, and you not only can hear but also see the great speakers of the world, and some of the greatest preachers, too. So the need for holding the interest of the audience in our churches is greater than ever before.

I am concerned about the increased emphasis on liturgy. I like a fine worship service, but I am concerned lest the liturgical emphasis be an attempt to compensate for mediocre preaching. The preacher, whether he realizes it or not, has a basically captive audience. He has few accurate measurements as to the effect of his words in interesting or stimulating an audience. Persons who sponsor television programs have measurements that tell exactly how many sets flick on or off at a particular moment, depending upon whether or not the performer is interesting his audience. The average meeting usually has applause and often a discussion period which indicates audience response. None of these devices is present in a church service. You all know how unreliable the comments you get at the door are. "That was a wonderful sermon, Dr. Jones," a member says at the door, but when he gets in the car he says to his wife, "The old boy was really off his feed today, wasn't he?"

It takes time—a great deal of it—to prepare an interesting, stimulating, and useful sermon. If you have 300 people listening to you on Sunday morning, that's 150 man-hours. Is it fair to the congregation who are spending that 150 man-hours if you let Mrs. Lotsatalk take up the time that you had set aside for preparing your sermon? This matter of Mrs. Lotsatalk brings me naturally to the third point.

III. A GOOD MANAGER

The layman has a right to expect that the minister should be a good manager. First of all, he should effectively manage his own time. This is no easy thing when you are in a profession dedicated to the service of others. But to serve his congregation best, a minister needs carefully to schedule his time as to pastoral work, counseling, community affairs, sermon prepara-

tion, personal development, and still save some time for family life.

It is a tragedy not in keeping with our Christian teachings that so many of our ministers' families never see them. I believe that the minister's program for allocation of time should be discussed with his pastoral relations committee, and should be put in writing. Then the pastoral relations committee should help interpret his program to the members of the congregation.

Many people do not think the minister is very busy; yet if he is doing his job, he is probably the busiest man in the community. We need to acquaint our congregations with that fact, so that the laymen can help the minister conserve his time in order to serve more effectively.

The minister should be expected to manage the church staff, office, and program efficiently. In my opinion, it is ridiculous *in even the smallest church* to have the sexton and organist report to committees. At our church, the sexton used to report to the lands and buildings committee, the minister of music reported to the music committee, the minister of education reported to the board of education, and so on. If you were trying to set up a system to breed inefficiency, you could not do it more effectively than to set up such a hydra-headed monster. So now our entire church staff, the persons I have named plus the minister of community service, the minister of pastoral service, and the secretarial and clerical staff, all report to the minister. The responsibilities of each member of the staff have been set down in writing and reviewed with the pastoral relations and staff committee. The pastor looks to the committee for broad guidance as to relations with the laymen, but the committee's major responsibility is to interpret the needs and the functions of the staff, including the pastor, to the entire congregation.

Sometimes I hear ministers say, "Yes, but my laymen won't give me proper secretarial service, or postage, or stationery." When I ask, "Did you clearly ask for it?" all too often the answer is "No." Good management involves setting up a proper plan and then marshaling the resources to carry it out. The needs for staff and office facilities need to be frankly stated to the laymen. Everybody loses when the minister suffers along with unexpressed needs.

As to the church program, the layman has a right to expect that the minister should give real direction to lay activities, making full use of the talents of laymen. Every church has a wide variety of specialists. As a minister said at dinner last night, "Why should I worry about our public-address system when we've got a telephone man in our congregation who is an authority on such equipment?" There is a telephone man in

almost every church, and certainly in every community. This minister went on to say that the man who is responsible for their public-address system never used to come to church. He sent his children to Sunday school; so one day the minister called him up and said, "Mr. So-and-So, we understand you are the town's leading authority on public-address systems, and we are appointing you to work with our music and building committees to plan the very best public-address system." The result was an installation that is so natural that few people are ever aware of the public-address system. The layman involved has taken such interest in it that he now attends church regularly and brings his entire family.

As a layman I would counsel, "Don't try to run the program details." Outline the broad things you want, provide guidance and education, then let the laymen in your church go on and do the job. But don't forget praise for the parts of a job well done, because praise from the minister is the lubrication which keeps many activities going so beautifully. After all, you all must have noticed the flowery introductions made by the bishop!

IV. A CONTINUING STUDENT

Fourth, I think the layman has a right to expect the minister to be a continuing student. I use the phrase "a continuing student" to suggest the constant search for accurate data and new truth that the scientist might describe as "the scientific attitude" or the academician might label "sound scholarship."

The layman has a right to know what religious scholarship has to say about the Bible, immortality, and other themes. Only continuing scholarship can bring truth freshly arrayed to the minister's preaching. Being a real student is a lifelong process. For the minister, it includes searching out the full facts before reaching decisions, keeping abreast of the entire realm of the behavioral sciences, and keeping up with the great social, political, technical, and economic developments of our time.

This is a large order. It involves an appalling amount of study, participation, and firsthand observation. Laymen need to understand that the minister must set aside ample time for reading and study. Business and industry, and all segments of our economy, should learn to help the minister gain a full understanding of their problems, goals, and values.

We are living in a period of almost unbelievable technological change. Eleven years ago only a few people in the United States knew that a jet-propelled airplane was possible. Now we think of jet planes as being very commonplace—thousands of them have been built and the jet engine

in the form of the gas turbine is driving locomotives, generating electric power, pumping gas through pipe lines, and driving ships at sea.

Less than nine years ago only a few scientists knew that it was possible to break down the atom. The bomb that fell on Hiroshima did more than destroy a Japanese city. It made obsolete much of man's technology. Engineers tell us that atomic plants will be generating electricity on an economical basis in five to ten years. They are confident that by the year 2000 most of our electric power will come from the atom.

I mention these startling technical advances for two reasons. First, we must keep our social institutions abreast of them. Second, we need to understand the value to human welfare of such technological developments.

Allan Nevins, one of the leading historians of our time, says that our nation's buoyant social structure arises out of two special factors that are not appreciated at their proper worth. First is the vigor of our organizing and business genius in this country and, second, our continued technological progress. He warns that their continuance is essential to our democratic system.

The money to carry on this research and technical progress must come primarily from the profits of our business enterprises, reinvested in further expansion. Therefore I am perplexed and concerned when Opinion Research of Princeton reports that 66 per cent of all ministers think that corporate taxes should be increased, and 73 per cent of Methodist ministers think so.

Today, out of every dollar of profits, a company pays fifty-two cents in federal income taxes. Part of the remainder goes to the shareholders who have invested their savings in the business. They receive their part as dividends on which they also pay income taxes. The balance is reinvested in the enterprise to finance the research and new facilities that are the source of new products and new jobs. Can a real student maintain that it would be in the public interest to impose further tax increases which would curtail technical progress?

Perhaps another finding of Opinion Research bothers me even more. The average minister estimated that companies made 18 per cent profit on sales, believed that this was too much, and said that 10 per cent would be a fair profit. The facts are that in the last ten years, the most prosperous years in our country's history, companies have averaged around 5 per cent. Thus the estimates of the ministers were more than 300 per cent high. Bernard Baruch has said, "Every man has a right to his own opinion, but no man has a right to be wrong in his facts." If the opinions regarding

taxes are based upon a wrong concept of the facts, then real students will want to rethink the entire matter.

Let me emphasize that I did not come here to plead the matter of taxes, or profits. I am trying to use these items merely as examples of the importance of basing our opinions and appraisals on a thorough understanding of the facts. That is what it means to be a continuing student.

V. PROFESSIONAL LEADERSHIP

Fifth, the layman expects the minister to build professional leadership. No profession has a greater opportunity to determine the future of this country and this world. I believe that the ministry must attract and hold our finest people. We can all glory in the great men it has attracted in the past. But its glorious past should not blind us to the needs for further professional development in the future.

A conference like this is important to professional growth. A minister told me recently, "When I used to work for a grocery chain, one day each month I had to leave the store of which I was manager and go out and work in another store. On these visits I was not supposed to tell the other store what I was doing better, but I was supposed to be finding out what the other store was doing better than I was." That kind of exchange could well be furthered in the ministry to the profit of all concerned.

We have sent our pastor off on a six-weeks' trip through the eastern part of the South, and across Louisiana and into Texas. There he is helping conduct a workshop on religious television. From Texas he will move up to Denver to deliver a series of lectures at Iliff School of Theology, and he will return by the northern route. Every day along the way he has appointments with ministers of churches in cities about the same size as Schenectady to find out what they are doing that we could adopt or adapt. I know that the ministers he visits will also get new ideas. Such mutual exchange, not in the vacuum of a hotel conference, but on location, is essential to professional development. I think you should not hesitate to ask your laymen to sponsor such trips or interchanges.

In the matter of professional development, I am concerned about recruiting and selection because we must find ways to bring the highest quality men into the ministry. Do you realize the tremendous changes that have taken place in recruiting of college graduates in a single generation?

Fifty years ago practically no company had training courses for

college graduates or did any regular college recruiting. By the 1920's a handful of companies had really good courses and were contacting colleges on a regular basis. Now it is estimated that more than 5,000 companies are contacting the colleges and culling their lists of graduates.

Yet it is my unhappy impression that some Protestant churches still cling to recruiting techniques designed to meet the competition of fifty years ago. We still rely upon men coming and saying, "I want to be a minister, and I'll take all financial hurdles put in my way." If we rely entirely on such volunteering, we are out of touch with the times. We do not realize what is happening.

As an example I think of a young man from a denominational college in the South. I know him well. He is outstanding in every way—intelligence, personality, appearance, speaking ability, leadership ability, and moral integrity. In college he had a local preacher's license and did a magnificent job in connection with every church he served. He led camps in the summer and had a fine youth program going the year round. In his senior year the Y.M.C.A. came to him and said, "We want you for Y.M.C.A. work; we have observed you here in the community; you are just the kind of man the 'Y' needs." He went with the Y.M.C.A.; and in discussing why, he told me, "Nobody in my church seemed to care."

The Y.M.C.A. said, "We want you, and we have a long-range plan for your development. If you get into the ministry, you'll be on some ladder to wait your turn, no matter how good you are." In only four years he has become general secretary of an important Y.M.C.A. Of course, we also need good men in the Y.M.C.A., but I am concerned as to why the church missed its opportunity. What bothers me most of all is that in talking with other ministers in his denomination I have the very uncomfortable feeling that they unconsciously welcomed the fact that such unusual and outstanding ability was not entering into competition with them.

The point I am trying to make is this: each of us, minister and layman alike, must seek to attract our very best young men into the ministry, but, in addition, a formal minister-recruiting program is long overdue.

Another aspect of professional leadership is proper compensation. We expect a minister to do all these things that I have talked about, pay off college debts, maintain a good library, drive a decent car, be available to go anywhere, dress well, subscribe to the latest magazines, belong to service clubs, support charities, send his children to college, entertain church guests and visitors, and do all these things on less income than is paid a sweeper in industry.

This pay comparison becomes all the more startling when you realize that the average minister invested four years of his life in college and three more in seminary and that he works, not forty hours a week, but probably sixty to eighty hours, and often a seven-day week.

Since 1939 the cost of living is up 93 per cent. Factory wages in the same period have gone up 150 per cent.¹ In other words, if a factory worker got \$40 per week in 1939, he gets \$100 per week today—not counting overtime. If your pastorate paid \$4,000 in 1939, then if it kept up with just the 93-per-cent increase in the cost of living, it should have been paying \$7,720 in 1954. If the minister's professional status, as measured by compensation, were to maintain its prewar relationship to factory wages, then the pastorate that paid \$4,000 in 1939 should have been up 150 per cent to \$10,000 in 1954.

The facts and figures I have cited are a serious indictment of us laymen. I am glad to say that a few of our churches are showing real leadership in correcting this situation. I think there is much that not only laymen but ministers can do to assure financial recognition of professional leadership.

What can you do about it? First, discuss your compensation frankly and openly and completely with your laymen.

Second, be sure that you get proper expense allowances. I believe that churches should work toward a system in which such items as postage, stationery, car and travel expenses, conferences, and business-type luncheons are reimbursed to the minister, exactly as they are in the fields of education or business. I think every minister should ask for such an arrangement.

Third, in working with your laymen, particularly on budgets, be very careful about such suggestions as, "If we can't do such and such in regard to the program, I will not accept a salary increase this year." I know that such a point of view stems from the very highest of motives; but it is harmful to your profession, to your family, to your associates, and to the pastor who will succeed you. Above all, it is harmful to the Church as a whole, because unless we attract and hold outstanding professional leadership, the future of the Church is jeopardized. So do not hesitate to ask your laymen for what you feel you should have, and you will make the job of any layman in your church, who is alerted to this need, much easier in bringing about higher compensation standards.

Now, in closing, let me emphasize that my five categories are not intended to be all-inclusive. You all know important aspects of the ministry

¹ Figures are from the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics.

that I have not mentioned. For example, every layman expects his minister to have a vital *personal* religion, not just a sterile, borrowed theology. He must be able to help members of his congregation relate themselves to the mysteries of this vast universe by dealing in a mature way with life and death, tragedy and victory, man and God.

If anything I have said has seemed to cut, I beg of you to bear in mind the old aphorism, "Faithful are the wounds of a friend." I respect, admire, and congratulate you as the growing edge of civilization. In a far greater measure than we feeble laymen have any right to expect, you daily provide moral leadership, intellectual stimulation, good management, the scholars' attitude, and professional leadership. You are the keepers of the dream. No other job in this world is so important.

The Institutional Forms of Christian Culture

CHRISTOPHER DAWSON

I

WE CANNOT SEPARATE culture from religion, any more than we can separate our life from our faith. As a living faith must change the life of the believer, so a living religion must influence and transform the social way of life, that is to say, the culture. It is impossible to be a Christian in church and a secularist or a pagan outside. Even a Christian minority, which lives a hidden and persecuted life, like the early Christians in the ages of the catacombs, possesses its own patterns of life and thought, which are the seeds of a new culture.

Nevertheless, it must be admitted that Christians are sometimes opposed to the very idea of Christian culture, since it seems to lead to an identification between a religious reality which is absolute and divine and a social reality which is limited and human. It was this point which inspired Kierkegaard's tremendous onslaught on "Christendom" as a colossal fraud—a betrayal of Christianity. "What we have before us," he writes, "is not Christianity but a prodigious illusion, and the people are not pagans but live in the blissful conceit that they are Christians."¹

When one sees what it is to be a Christian in Denmark, how could it occur to anyone that this is what Jesus Christ talks about: cross and agony and suffering, crucifying the flesh, suffering for the doctrine, being salt, being sacrificed, etc.? No, in Protestantism, especially in Denmark, Christianity marches to a different melody, to the tune of "Merrily we roll along, roll along, roll along!"—Christianity is enjoyment of life, tranquillized, as neither the Jew nor the pagan was, by the assurance that the thing about eternity is settled, settled precisely in order that we might find pleasure in enjoying this life, as well as any pagan or Jew.²

¹Kierkegaard, S., *Attack Upon "Christendom."* Translated by Walter Lowrie, Princeton University Press, 1944 (London: Oxford University Press), p. 97.

²*Ibid.*, pp. 34-35.

CHRISTOPHER DAWSON is an English Catholic historian and philosopher of culture, author of two series of Gifford Lectures: *Religion and Culture* and *Religion and the Rise of Western Culture*. His most recent work is *Medieval Essays*, on the influences of East and West in the formation of medieval civilization. This lecture was given at a symposium on religion and culture at the University College of Wales, August, 1953.

God's thought in introducing Christianity was, if I may venture to say so, to pound the table hard in front of us men. . . . God succeeded in this, he really overawed men. But gradually the human race came to itself, and shrewd as it is, it saw that to do away with Christianity by force was not practicable—"so let us do it by cunning," they said. We are all Christians and so Christianity is *eo ipso* abolished.³

Man's knavish interest consists in creating millions and millions of Christians, the more the better, all men if possible; for thus the whole difficulty of being a Christian vanishes, being a Christian and being a man amounts to the same thing, and we find ourselves where paganism ended.

Christendom has mocked God and continues to mock Him—just as if to a man who is a lover of nuts, instead of bringing him one nut with a kernel, we were to bring him tons and millions of empty nut-shells.⁴

What Kierkegaard attacked with such passion, however, was *not* Christendom but the secularization of Christendom, and especially that particular form of secularization which he found in the Danish State Church of the mid-nineteenth century. For he was living in a culture which was undergoing a rapid and complete process of secularization, and what infuriated him was the refusal of the clergy to admit the real state of affairs, so long as they could retain their official status and prerogatives.

But the fact that Christian culture had become moribund in Denmark in 1850 does not prove that it had never existed. There had been a time, as he himself admitted, when "Christendom" had meant something. Christianity was a historical reality which had actually come into the world and had transformed the societies with which it came into contact. Leaving aside for the moment the question of the relation between the religious ideal of Christianity and the social forms in which it embodied itself, there can be no doubt that Christianity in the past has been a creative cultural force of the first magnitude, and that it has actually created a Christian culture or a number of Christian cultures. The same, of course, is true of other religions. In fact, every great civilization that exists in the world today has a great religious tradition associated with it, and it is impossible to understand the culture unless we understand the religion that lies behind it.

This is accepted by the orientalist and usually also by the student of more primitive cultures. No one pretends to understand Arab or Persian culture without knowing something about Islam and the beliefs and institutions that are common to the whole Moslem world. Only in the case of Europe has this elementary consideration been neglected. We have had countless studies of Western culture and histories of European society which leave out Christianity or treat it as of secondary importance.

³ *Ibid.*, pp. 166-67.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 156.

II

To a great extent this state of things is due to that educational schism of which I have spoken elsewhere. Our approach to the study of our culture has been influenced for centuries by the image of an idealized classical culture which was treated as the absolute standard of Western culture, so that whatever conflicted with or diverged from this was ignored as barbarous.

But this is not the only factor. For, in addition to the cultural idealism of the Humanists, there was also a religious idealism which had a very similar effect on men's judgments on the history of Western culture. For at the time that the Humanists were exalting the ideal of a classical culture which had been forgotten for a thousand years, the Reformers were preaching the return to an ideal type of Christianity which had also been lost for a thousand years.

The cumulative effect of these tendencies was to turn men's attention away from the historical reality of Christian culture toward an ideal classical culture and an ideal primitive Christianity, so that in looking for something that was not there, they overlooked the things that were before their eyes—the historical forms of Western Christian culture as they had actually existed.

But by this time these historical forms have become remote and unfamiliar, so that it is necessary to study them anew in the same objective way in which we study the great oriental cultures of the past. Indeed, in many respects the Christian culture of the past resembles the culture of Islam more than it resembles modern Western culture. Nor is this surprising, since the three great Western religions, Judaism, Christianity, and Islam, are closely related to one another and share a number of common features. In all of them, in contrast to the modern world, the primary social bond was not political but religious, and consequently a man's relation to his religious community had many of the characteristics that we associate with political citizenship. The religious community was the absolute one, and all other communities—family, state, and nation—were relative ones, parts of a greater whole.

In the second place, all these cultures centered in a tradition of sacred learning: a divine Scripture, a sacred law, a sacred history, and a sacred oral tradition. This sacred tradition was alone regarded as *learning* in the absolute sense. In some cases this sacred learning might represent the whole of learning and the only literary culture; in other cases there was also a tradition of secular learning, but this was secondary and supplementary.

In the third place, in all these cultures the first social duty and conse-

quently the primary cultural activity was the act of worship. In Islam this act was so closely connected with the recitation of the Koran that it produced little liturgical development, yet even so it holds a central place in Moslem culture.

In Christianity, on the other hand, the liturgy was the center of a rich tradition of religious poetry and music and artistic symbolism. In fact, the art of Christendom in both its Byzantine and medieval phases was essentially a liturgical art which cannot be understood without some knowledge of the liturgy itself and its historical origin and development. And the same is true to a great extent of popular and vernacular culture. The popular religious drama, which had such an important influence on the rise of European drama as a whole, was either a liturgical drama in the strict sense, like the Passion plays and Nativity plays, or was directly related to the cult of the saints and the celebration of their feasts. For the cult of the saints, which had its basis in the liturgy, was the source of a vast popular mythology, and provided a bridge between the higher ecclesiastical and literary culture and the peasant culture with its archaic traditions of folklore and magic.

In the same way the church itself—I mean the liturgical edifice—was at the same time the organ of both the higher and the lower culture, and consequently a great instrument of social integration. On the one hand it was the temple in which the liturgy was celebrated in the common language of educated Christendom, and, on the other, in the village and the pilgrimage place it was the center of the common people for whom it was at once school and theater and picture gallery.

It is at this point that the cultural division produced by the Reformation is seen most clearly. The church ceased to be the organ of popular culture in art and symbolism. It retained its educational importance, to a great extent, but the change of the liturgy changed the nature of the religious culture. And thus while in Catholic Europe, as for example in Spain, the drama and painting and sculpture retained their religious character and were still the organs of a Christian culture common to the educated and the uneducated—in Protestant Europe the arts became secularized and the Bible only, the reading of the Bible and the preaching of the Bible, became the chief and almost the only vehicle of Christian culture.

In all these respects there is a remarkable agreement between the cultures of Byzantine Orthodoxy and Western Catholicism. The liturgies are different, the art is different, the music is different, but there is the same organic relation between them in the two cultures. The Byzantine attitude to the Holy Images is more rigid and in a sense more theological than the

Western attitude to the images of the saints, but there is the same conception of religious art as a necessary organ of Christian culture and there is the same attitude to the cult of the saints as the mirrors of Christian perfection and the mediators between the spiritual and sensible worlds. Moreover, both cultures share the same conception of spiritual hierarchy—that analogy between the ecclesiastical and the celestial hierarchies, which is one of the keys to the traditional Christian conception of the universal order.

III

Finally there is one great religious institution which is common to the two cultures and which has perhaps had a greater and more direct influence on the formation of Christian culture than any other single factor: I mean the monastic order. It is in monasticism that religion and culture attain their most complete fusion. For the monastic rule is a sacred law which is applied to every detail of individual life and becomes the basis of a common way of life and a common society. So the latter was in principle a totally Christian society in which there was no longer any room for the conflict between religious and secular standards, a society without private property or family bonds or political and military obligations. At first sight it seems an impossible system, since its social order rests on the denial of the three main forces which have created society—sex and war and economic acquisitiveness. Nevertheless, in spite of manifold failures, it exerted a dynamic influence on every aspect of Christian culture. Its influence was especially important on the new Christian society of the barbarian North, where there was no tradition of city culture. Here the coming of the monks meant not only a new religious way of life but a new civilization, so that the Western monasteries were islands of Christian culture in a sea of barbarism.

No institution in the history of Christian culture has been more intensively studied than this. But the best studies are those of particular orders and monasteries, and I do not think there is any work which deals adequately with Christian monasticism as a whole and particularly with the relation between the different forms of monasticism and the different forms of Christian culture. We can distinguish a number of successive types of monasticism, each of which is typical of a particular phase in the development of Christian culture.

First, there is the original oriental type of monasticism, as it was organized by St. Pachomius in Egypt in 323, and which was rapidly diffused from one end of the Christian world to the other. This is the form of

monasticism which was practically the creator of Celtic Christian culture and determined the ecclesiastical character of the Celtic Church.

Second, there is Benedictine monasticism, which is the classical type of Western monasticism, and was the foundation of Carolingian and early medieval culture and of Western education. From this common Benedictine tradition there developed first the Cluniac reform of the tenth century, and secondly the Cistercian order, which attained such a vast extension in the twelfth century and which was the first religious order in the modern sense of the word.

Thirdly, there are the Friars, above all the Franciscans and the Dominicans, who were the leading force in thirteenth-century culture and who played such a decisive part in the life of the medieval universities and in the development of scholastic philosophy.

Finally there are the Jesuits, the great Counter-Reformation order, whose influence on the post-Renaissance and Baroque culture of Catholic Europe can hardly be exaggerated, above all in the sphere of education.

Thus the development of monasticism corresponds very closely with the development of Christian culture, so that the history of Christian culture is comprised in the 1,450 years between the foundation of the first monastery by St. Pachomius at Tabennisi in 323 to the dissolution of the Society of Jesus in 1773.

Of course this criterion excludes the culture of Protestant Europe, and in fact it was the dissolution of the monasteries and the rejection of the monastic ideal which, more than any theological question or any question of ecclesiastical order, was the revolutionary change that separated Protestant Europe from the Christian culture of the past. Nevertheless, the same spiritual forces which produced monasticism remained active in the Protestant world.

This activity is to be seen in the formation of the sects, considered not as theological doctrines but as new ways of religious life. And, accordingly, if we wish to find the sociological analogies of the religious orders in the Protestant world we must look to such organizations as the Anabaptists, the Puritan sects, the Pietists, the Quakers, the Methodists, and the Plymouth Brothers (not to mention the more eccentric American developments, like the Shakers, which went so far as to insist on celibacy and the community of property).

In some of these sects, like the Dunkers and the Amana Society, we find a conscious attempt to create a totally separate Christian culture with its own

economic and social order, its own forms of dress and behavior, and even its own rudimentary forms of art. But none of them have any historical or religious importance, except as specimens of eccentric development.

Excluding these extreme and abnormal types, this sectarian development has had considerable influence on the culture of Protestant Europe and America, as has been shown in detail by writers like Max Weber and Ernst Troeltsch. But in so far as sectarianism involves the separation of church and state and regards secular society as a neutral field common to the different sectarian groups, each of which is spiritually self-contained, it has been a factor which has made for the secularization of culture, or for that semi-secularized type of culture that was characteristic of Britain and the United States of America in the nineteenth century.

Nevertheless, as we cannot understand Western culture as a whole without a study of the great Christian culture which lies behind it, so also we cannot understand the culture of modern England and Wales and America unless we have studied the underworld of sectarian Christianity—a world which has been so neglected by the political and economic historian, but which none the less contributed so many vital elements to the complex pattern of nineteenth-century society.

IV

This, however, is a digression; what I am primarily concerned with is the need for a more thorough and systematic study of the main tradition of Christian culture in its three great phases: the age of the Fathers, the Middle Ages, and the Baroque period. For it is only by this large-scale study of a whole civilization, covering many centuries of continuous development, that we can understand the process of change by which a new religion enters an old society and is partially assimilated by it, so that the way of life of the society as well as of the individual is changed; and how out of this process a new culture arises which may be transmitted to other societies and may change them also.

Furthermore, it is essential for us to study this particular religion-culture because it is the source of our own culture; and our judgment of other religions and other cultures must inevitably be seen through this medium. For the idea that the historian or the sociologist is in a privileged position, from which he can study any and every culture and religion in Olympian detachment, is really an absurdity and the source of countless errors and absurdities in thought and practice.

Finally, there is a peculiar value in the study of Christian culture, because there is no culture that illustrates so completely the essential dualism between Religion and Culture and the element of conflict and spiritual tension which this dualism involves. There are societies, especially the more primitive and backward societies, in which this dualism seems absent, and in these cases religion becomes inseparable from custom and has little or no dynamic importance as a cause of social change. On the other hand, there are religions that are nonsocial, which expressly disassociate themselves from any responsibility for social life and culture, and while these often possess considerable dynamic energy their appeal is a negative one, so that they are revolutionary and subversive forces.

But in Christianity the tendency to a world-renouncing asceticism co-exists with a tendency toward social and cultural activity, and it is the tension of these two forces that has given Christianity its characteristic power to change society and to create new cultural forms.

This question of the influence of Christianity on social change has received a good deal more attention from the historians recently than it did in the past. In particular, a number of writers like Stepan and Berdyaev have interpreted the Russian revolutionary movement in terms of the Russian religious tradition, both the tradition of the Orthodox Church and that of the sects.

So, too, in the case of English history, the late Elie Halevy attributed great importance to the rise of Methodism and the Evangelical Movement in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, but for the opposite reason—that is, as one of the main causes of the nonrevolutionary character of the development of English society in the age of the French Revolution.

In all these ways the study of Christian culture is important to the historian. But, above all, far outweighing any other consideration, there is the fact that Christian culture was identical with Western culture during the centuries of formation and growth, and that it was the integrative force which first united the different peoples of Western Europe in a new community. What Hellenism was to the ancient world, Christendom has been to the modern. So that to attempt to understand the modern world without any study of Christian culture is as difficult as it would be to understand the Roman world without any knowledge of Hellenism.

Fundamentalism and Modernism in Perspective

ROBERT T. HANDY

AFTER A SERIOUS CONFLICT, bitter memories often long remain. They can hinder the wholesome development of individuals and groups. Religious contention especially may leave scars that make difficult the exercise of the virtues of love and humility—scars that continue to divide in a day when those who call themselves Christian need to understand and trust one another. In the 1920's the Fundamentalist-Modernist controversy raged in American Protestantism, and like all internal strife it has left bitterness and suspicion in its wake.

Fresh considerations of the episode from a broad historical perspective may help to heal old wounds. Of course, full treatment would require a sizable volume, but an effort to suggest in a somewhat impressionistic and preliminary way the larger historical context in which the struggle was set may contribute to fuller understanding.

Though the controversy took place in the third decade of the twentieth century, its roots run deep in American religious history. To trace these roots is to throw the struggle of the 1920's into clearer perspective and to cast light on the present religious situation in the United States. To find these roots we must go back to Protestant beginnings in the seventeenth century.

I

Representatives of all of the major and most of the minor Protestant traditions came to this country in the seventeenth century. As a group they were inclined to emphasize the authority of the Bible as against the authority of church or tradition. The majority of colonial Protestants were of Calvinist theological orientation—Congregationalists, Presbyterians, Reformed, and Baptists bore the stamp of Geneva and together formed a clear majority. The usual Protestant stress on the authority of the Bible they held with particular intensity. Thus American Protestant foundations,

ROBERT T. HANDY, B.D., Ph.D., is Associate Professor of Church History at Union Theological Seminary, New York City. This article is based upon a lecture delivered as part of the Summer Session program on "Fundamentalism" at the Riverside Church, New York City, in 1954.

heavily mortared by Calvinist emphases, were solidly built on biblical soil before the rise of critical or skeptical attitudes toward the Scriptures had made any extensive impact upon the religious world. They were laid before the traditional supernaturalistic world view had been popularly questioned. The Bible was understood to be an adequate and absolute authority concerning the great questions of life.

Especially among the Puritans of New England was the doctrine of biblical authority confidently asserted. The Puritans articulated in fullest fashion what was widely accepted. Indeed, they based their whole religious and civil system upon the authority of the Scriptures. They insisted that the Word of God is clear and explicit, and shows forth a plain law to be followed by all. Convinced that the highly educated Puritan divines could and did correctly interpret the Scriptures, the Puritans declared that whoever disagreed with the considered interpretations of the pastors showed himself to be knave or fool, fit subject for persecution for sinning against his own conscience. Harsh indeed was the treatment accorded dissenters! And though other colonial Protestants might find that their understanding of the Scriptures carried them in a different (and less rigorous) direction, the intense Puritans illustrate, if in somewhat exaggerated fashion, the general assumptions as to the authority of the Bible.

These same Puritans, with their firm faith in the authority of Scripture, were also men of intellectual competence and integrity. They were for the most part sincere, honest, and able scholars. They had no fear of new knowledge, classical or scientific. As T. J. Wertenbaker has expressed it:

Whereas the New England leaders tried desperately to close the doors of their Zion to heresy, they threw them wide open to philosophy and science. They accepted knowledge as an ally: had no fear of it as an enemy, since scientific truth could not clash with revealed truth. So the ministers and other educated men sent to England for the latest works of Newton, Halley, Kepler, Boyle and other great thinkers, and not only accepted their findings but sought to use the new light which they shed on the wonders of God's world to buttress Christian faith.

That is, these Puritan Protestants sought to keep faith and reason in creative tension. Wertenbaker adds, "It is a tribute to the intellectual honesty and to the clear thinking of the Puritan scientists that in most cases they would not let preconceived religious interpretations or belief in supernatural occurrences interfere with their observations or falsify their conclusions."¹ And, again, the Puritans illustrate in clearest terms what can be said about the majority of colonial Protestants: they were

¹ Wertenbaker, T. J., *The Puritan Oligarchy: The Founding of American Civilization*, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1947, pp. 252, 264.

men of firm faith, but they were also honest seekers of knowledge. Faith and reason fertilized one another.

In the course of time, however, these two aspects of Protestant concern became separated—torn apart by the storms of history. An important key for understanding American Protestant history in general and the Fundamentalist-Modernist controversy in particular is the story of how these two facets of the Protestant spirit were separated, and the struggle to bring them together again.

The religious history of the eighteenth century was marked by the opening of a gulf between faith and reason. Two powerful religious movements gave direction to the spiritual life of that century. One of these movements can for convenience be tabbed "rationalism." The rationalist spirit manifested itself in various specific ways, as in Latitudinarianism, Deism, and Unitarianism, but in a general way it was felt throughout Protestantism. Stressing the role of reason in religion, rationalism preferred natural to revealed religion, or at least insisted on an important role for the natural. Its view of man reflected more the optimistic attitudes of the Enlightenment to the realistic views of classical Christianity; it assessed favorably the competence of human reason in seeking answers to ultimate questions and raised hard questions about the nature of biblical authority. At first, the movement spread cautiously and slowly in religious circles, but in the last quarter of the eighteenth century, in the revolutionary epoch, it quickly grew militant and aggressive. Its prestige was high in those years in which reason was seen to be triumphing over the prejudices of the past, freeing man from shackles which had long bound him. Many Protestants were attracted to rationalist religion, with its elevation of human reason and its restriction of the role of faith.

The other movement can be referred to as "evangelical pietism." It retained many of the features of seventeenth-century Protestantism, but in a simpler, less articulate way. It was Bible-centered, with emphasis on faith, conversion, and the emotional experiences of religion. The "Great Awakenings" which swept colonial America from the 1720's to the Revolution won many converts to this form of Protestantism in which the stress was on "heart religion" and spiritual experience.

These two movements introduced sharp tension into the Protestant world. Perry Miller has observed that by the middle of the eighteenth century there had proceeded from Puritan Protestantism "two distinct schools of thought, almost unalterably opposed to each other. Certain elements were carried into the creeds and practices of the evangelical

religious revivals, but others were perpetuated by the rationalists and the forerunners of Unitarianism.”² The eighteenth century tended to pull apart what the seventeenth had sought to keep together.

Thanks to the Great Awakenings, the evangelical pietists were ascendant for much of the century, but in the final quarter of the century confident rationalism and militant Deism made sweeping gains. But not for long. The French Revolution was at first favorably hailed in this country, but when the excesses of the Terror became known, there was a considerable revulsion of feeling. Under the leadership of such men as Timothy Dwight at Yale, the forces of orthodoxy pressed their advantage. They laid the blame for what had transpired at the door of rationalism, which, they asserted, inevitably leads to “infidelity.” With renewed confidence and redoubled vigor they sought to crush out rationalism, and found the religious revival an effective instrument for the purpose. They did not stop to distinguish between the various strands of the rationalist movement, nor did they seek to separate good from bad elements in it—they were inclined to condemn the whole thing. Their revivals were highly effective in influencing public opinion, and in the new century the rationalist movement withered while the evangelicals rose to a position of dominance in the American religious scene.

Of course, some exceptions must be noted. Unitarianism, for example, emerged as a separate denomination in this period, institutionalizing some of the rationalist currents. But it was largely isolated from the Protestant world when the revivals were turned against it, and to a considerable degree it was sealed off in its eastern Massachusetts home. It remained small, while the popular denominations in which the evangelical pietist interpretation of the faith was central mushroomed to giant stature.

What the evangelicals did not realize was that in suppressing rationalism they were also driving out from among themselves something which was really part of their own inheritance. Their seventeenth-century ancestors had sought to keep faith and reason in creative interchange, but now a wide gulf had been opened and faith was set against reason. Hence, as Sidney E. Mead has skillfully explained,³ nineteenth-century Protestantism, despite its many strengths, had a peculiar weakness—it was difficult for it to deal competently with intellectual problems. It was ill-prepared to cope with the currents of thought which were flowing in the new century. Its theological acuteness had been seriously dulled. Indeed, it was unable

² Miller, Perry, and Johnson, Thomas H., *The Puritans*, New York, American Book Co., 1938, p. 3.

³ Cf. especially his important interpretative article, “Denominationalism: The Shape of Protestantism in America,” *Church History*, XXIII (December, 1954), 291-320.

to see that it actually had adopted a number of insights—particularly regarding the nature of man and society—from the rationalist currents it professed to reject. It sought to build its house on unreconciled theoretical foundations; it loved God with heart, soul, and strength, but scarcely with mind. Difficult but important theological issues were often avoided by emotional appeal, or were dealt with in the oversimplified fashion of the revivalist. The conservative, revivalistic, missionary-minded, Bible-centered evangelical Protestantism of the nineteenth century was well adapted for expanding across a continent, but its theological reductionism was later to prove to be a serious thorn.

II

The Civil War broke the vials so that the acids of modernity began to cut into traditional patterns of life and thought. Science and technology began to change both the world of thought and the world of practice. How swiftly the climate of opinion and the ways of life changed! With understandable exaggeration, Henry Adams once declared that his country in 1900 was something totally different from his country in 1860; he was convinced that "in essentials like religion, ethics, philosophy; in history, literature, art; in the concepts of all science, except perhaps mathematics, the American boy of 1854 stood nearer the year 1 than to the year 1900."⁴ Into this dynamic period evangelical Protestantism boldly stepped, hoping to permeate the nation's life yet more thoroughly than before, and make it fully Christian. But the passage proved to be a disputed one.

The intellectual currents that were unleashed were not long in sweeping down upon ministers and laymen, especially those in the larger cities and educational centers of the north and east. Sensitive minds were seriously troubled. The period before the Civil War had been an age of faith, but the years after were aptly labeled by Henry Van Dyke as "an age of doubt." Many pastors found that their congregations were losing the old certainty. The authority of the Bible over all aspects of life was being called into question in some quarters. Many wondered if indeed biblical authority had not really been undermined by new views concerning the origin of the world as presented by geologists, or by novel concepts about the development of the human race by evolutionists.

In the later nineteenth century, a steadily growing group of ministers, themselves influenced by the new currents of thought, sought a new apology for faith, an apology suited to a scientific age. They sought to

⁴ *The Education of Henry Adams: An Autobiography*, Houghton Mifflin Co., 1918, p. 53.

stand between their inherited faith and the new knowledge; they were seeking to stiffen the faith of those who had begun to doubt, but to do it by speaking in the terms of the new day. Thus there emerged out of the womb of evangelical Protestantism a movement which may be called "evangelical liberalism." Its early leaders were evangelicals: they believed in the divinity of Christ and accepted the authority of the Bible in matters religious, but they sought to express this in the idiom of the time in which they worked. They were mediators, endeavoring to defend faith by restating it in terms congenial to current concepts.

Henry Ward Beecher, whose fame as a pulpiteer apparently sprang from his uncanny ability to express the commonplaces of his congregations in an eloquent and apt way, summed up the feelings of the liberal group with his customary finesse. He declared:

If ministers do not make their theological systems conform to facts as they are; if they do not recognize what men are studying, the time will not be far distant when the pulpit will be like the voice crying in the wilderness. . . . The providence of God is rolling forward a spirit of investigation that Christian ministers must meet and join. There is no class of people upon earth who can less afford to let the development of truth run ahead of them than they.⁵

Liberalism thus came from within Protestantism as evangelicals sought to minister to people troubled by the new trends of thought; it was not a movement grafted onto Protestantism from the outside. The first-generation liberals were almost all of them men of warmhearted personal piety. What they were really trying to do was to pull together again the two parts of the Protestant soul that had long been separated; they were seeking to bring faith and reason together again in creative interchange.

The balance, however, was difficult to achieve—if the scales had been for long tipped one way, they now could too easily shift. As the liberals opened their minds to the intellectual movements of their day it suddenly seemed as though the inherited patterns of Protestant orthodoxy were remote and medieval. The religious homes in which they had been reared seemed to grow smaller and shabbier, even as did the humble homesteads in the country where not a few of them had begun life's pilgrimage—neither seemed quite suited to the brave new world of scientific progress. Theodore T. Munger, a persuasive voice from a liberal pulpit, put forcefully enough his reasons for finding inadequate the version of the faith he had been taught as a child. He wrote:

⁵ Quoted in Ernest Trice Thompson, *Changing Emphases in American Preaching*, Westminster Press, 1943, p. 86.

The Old Theology stands on a structure of logic outside of humanity; it selects a fact like the divine sovereignty or sin, and inflates it till it fills the whole space about man, seeing in him only the subject of a government against which he is a sinner; it has nothing to say of him as he plays with his babe, or freely marches in battle to sure death for his country, or transacts, in honest ways, the honest business of the world. It lifts him out of his manifold and real relations, out of the wide and rich complexity of actual life, and carries him over into a mechanically constructed and ideal world,—a world made up of five propositions, like Calvinism or some other such system,—and views him only in the light of that world; teaches him that there is no other world for him to consider, and that his life and destiny are bounded by it, that there is no truth, no reality, no duty, no proper field for the play of his powers, no operation of the Spirit of God, no revelation of God, outside of this sharply-defined theological world.⁶

But the widest divergences between old theology and new lay in the understanding of the Bible—the evangelical liberals regarded it as an inspired work, to be sure, but understood it as literature and history, the compilation of many generations, the product of men describing their experiences of God under the guidance of the Spirit, a spiritual library in which the human factor could cause errors of fact. They sought to interpret the Scriptures in what they felt was a natural way, and to this end listened to the teachings of the critical scholars. Inevitably, great tension arose between them and those who remained within the fold of conservative evangelical Protestantism and resisted all such approaches to the Bible.

Sometimes those who set out on a journey find that it takes them farther than they had expected to go. Some of the liberals began to find evangelical emphases no longer relevant. The very idea of special revelation seemed no longer very certain to some of them; they preferred to seek out the general revelation of God in nature and history instead of a particular revelation of God in Christ. Out of evangelical liberalism, therefore, toward the close of the century, came a drift theologically leftward as some sought to ground faith by empirical method on some other basis than the Bible. The new movement can be broadly distinguished from evangelical liberalism, just as *that* can be distinguished from conservative evangelicalism; perhaps some such term as “scientific modernism” can be adopted to refer to the theological radicals. They were always a smaller group than the evangelical liberals, but they attracted much attention. The two movements were often confused, even by their adherents. The broader movement, which by the turn of the century had captured some leading seminaries and was influencing the lives of a number of denominations, was not infrequently tarred with the wrong brush.

⁶ Munger, T. T., *The Freedom of Faith*, Houghton Mifflin Co., 1886, p. 29.

III

In certain parts of America, especially in the rural towns and in the South, the new intellectual winds of the nineteenth century blew faint, and the theological storms taking place in the northern centers warned the faithful to erect storm signals lest the whirlwind descend upon them. To many evangelicals, the liberal expression of faith seemed not to defend it but to threaten the very foundations of true faith. If once the secure foundations of biblical authority were abandoned, who could say where the journey would end? And the tendency of some liberals to move leftward to radical positions seemed to confirm the dangers. Hence many clung all the more firmly to the conservative, evangelical faith in which they were brought up.

Some clung to it in essentially the same form in which it had been shaped in the earlier part of the century—Dwight L. Moody is perhaps the chief representative of this continuation. Firm in his belief in the Bible, conservative in his theological orientation, warm in his evangelical fervor, Moody was nevertheless a man of some breadth who welcomed liberal scholars to his platforms as long as he felt them to be sincere in their Christian faith. But while Moody continued the evangelistic “new measures” pattern of Charles G. Finney, others had begun to narrow and harden the faith they had received into a stricter conservatism. Against the reformation of liberalism they shaped the counter-reformation of a more militant conservatism. Against dangerous tendencies in biblical and theological thinking, they sought to erect an impenetrable wall. They could find comfort and assistance from the more “confessionally” orthodox, for example in Presbyterian and Reformed denominations.

This “strict” conservatism dramatized its protest against what was conceived to be defection from Christian faith on the part of the liberals by emphasizing doctrines that the liberals almost instinctively sought to modify. The strict conservatives placarded their adherence to premillennialist views, heralding their faith that Jesus would soon return bodily to establish his millennium on earth. Liberals were inclined to reinterpret eschatological beliefs in terms of progressive, evolutionary thought. By forwarding premillennialist views the alarmed conservatives were underlining their rejection of attempts to mediate between historic faith and contemporary culture.

Frank Hugh Foster, in his work, *The Modern Movement in American Theology*, selected the year 1877 as marking the “public and open indication” of the liberalizing of theology. Significantly enough, that very same

year there was held in New York a great Prophetic Conference, a chief purpose of which was to accent the theme of the imminent return of the Lord. The conference attracted hundreds of ministers and thousands of lay people, most of whom were seriously impressed. The daily papers reported the activities of the gathering in great detail; the religious press reflected the contribution of the meeting for many months. A second such conference was held in Chicago in 1885. One report of this assembly noted that "there were present ministers of all denominations from all parts of the United States and Canada. Nearly all of the city clergy were present, and hundreds of earnest Christians of every shade of belief from every Church, charitable institution, and missionary institution in the city."⁷ These conferences awoke many people to the dangers of the secularization of faith. They analyzed and deplored the compromises made by the churches with the world; they criticized the influence of reason in religion. They vigorously upheld the authority of the Bible as an infallible, inerrant, verbally inspired Word of God.

The conservative mood was intensified by the work of many traveling evangelists. There were great numbers of them, and the orientation of the majority of them swung in a direction narrower and more inflexible than that of Moody. There were literally hundreds of these itinerant revivalists. Indeed, a journalist who ventured to write an over-all story of American revivalism in 1928 could even say, "If collected in one volume with only a paragraph apiece, the revivalists of the past fifty years would form a book that would dwarf an unabridged dictionary."⁸ Grover Loud went on to select a few for brief characterization in his colorful style. For example, he describes the activities of Sam Jones—a Georgia lawyer, redeemed from rum by the Methodists, he never forgot how to plead before a jury. For a quarter century he carried on his intensive evangelical crusades; rough-boarded tabernacles were built for him all over the South. But the North knew him, too; from his southern headquarters he would launch attacks on northern centers, and they turned out in droves to hear him, many to be converted. The tendency was for the revivalists more and more to support the stricter conservative resistance to liberal trends, and thousands of Protestants were influenced.

The conservative counter-reformation was strengthened further by the success of annual Bible conferences. The Niagara Bible Conference first met in 1876. Others, such as the Winona and the Rocky Mountain

⁷ Quoted by Stewart G. Cole in his pioneer study, *The History of Fundamentalism*, New York, R. R. Smith, 1931, p. 33.

⁸ Loud, Grover C., *Evangelized America*, Lincoln MacVeagh, The Dial Press, 1928, p. 257.

Conferences, soon followed. It was at the Niagara Conference in 1895 that a theological statement was prepared in the effort to present a clear statement of strict conservative belief. The statement stood for the inerrancy of Scripture in every respect, the deity of Jesus, the virgin birth, the substitutionary atonement, the physical resurrection and bodily return of Jesus Christ. These positions are sometimes called the "five points of fundamentalism," but that obscures the difference between strict conservatives and fundamentalists.

The main difference between them was probably more a matter of mood and spirit than basic theological divergence. Both subscribed to orthodox Protestant theological tenets, but the fundamentalists were more aggressive, more intransigent, more certain that they had the whole truth and their opponents had none. They not only militantly asserted the plenary inspiration of Scripture, but insisted that they had correctly apprehended its meaning and their opponents not at all. They worked closely with the strict conservatives, and in the struggle against rapidly advancing liberalism and modernism in the first three decades of the twentieth century attempted to take over leadership of the whole conservative movement of the major evangelical denominations. Conservatives had many men of scholarly temperament in their ranks; fundamentalists tended to be less and less concerned with scholarship as the movement reached its climax in the 1920's.

The fundamentalist forces were rallied by the publication of a dozen small volumes entitled *The Fundamentals: A Testimony to the Truth*. The appearance of these paper-bound booklets in the years prior to the first World War (1909-1915) was financed by Lyman and Milton Stewart, wealthy brothers who founded Los Angeles Bible Institute and supported extensive missionary and evangelistic enterprises. In the series appeared essays of conservatives and fundamentalists from the United States and abroad. Over three million copies of these works were circulated; pastors, theological professors, and their students received free copies. On matters of biblical interpretation, *The Fundamentals* yielded no ground at all to the critical scholars. At the very time when the major seminaries were accepting the main results of the work of the biblical critics, these writings resisted the whole trend. At the same time that the documentary theories of the origin of the first five books of the Bible were informing the minds of many thoughtful ministers and theological students, *The Fundamentals* reported outright:

According to the faith of the universal church, the Pentateuch, that is, the

first five books of the Bible, is one consistent, coherent, authentic and genuine composition, inspired by God, and, according to the testimony of the Jews, the statements of the books themselves, the reiterated corroborations of the rest of the Old Testament, and the explicit statement of the Lord Jesus (Luke 24:44, John 5:46-47) was written by Moses (with the exception, of course, of Deut. 34, possibly written by Joshua, as the Talmud states, or probably by Ezra) at a period of about fourteen centuries before the advent of Christ, and 800 years or so before Jeremiah.⁹

The booklets, with their anti-evolution, anti-liberal, anti-social-gospel tone, were widely read and quite influential. They provided a rallying point for the conservatively inclined, and won many of them to an extreme position.

IV

After the first World War was over, fundamentalists resolved to stop the further progress of liberalism and modernism, which, from their point of view, was a journey into apostasy. In the struggle for control, the somewhat complex theological picture which has been here suggested (though still in oversimplified fashion) was obscured, and it seemed as though Protestantism had broken into two warring camps.

Fundamentalists believed that only they spoke for genuine Protestant faith, and called for a new organization of Protestantism. So J. Gresham Machen of Princeton, a scholarly conservative who had thrown in his lot with fundamentalism, declared:

Two mutually exclusive religions are being propagated within the Presbyterian church, as within other "evangelical" churches. One is the great redemptive religion known as Christianity; the other is the naturalistic or agnostic modernism represented by Dr. Fosdick and by many Presbyterian ministers. If one of these is true the other is false. It is, therefore, quite intolerable that both of them should be propagated by the same funds and with the endorsement of the same organization. . . . It is high time that all mental reservations, all "interpretations" which really are thoroughgoing contradictions of perfectly plain documents, should be abandoned and that there should be a return to common sense and common honesty.¹⁰

Dean R. A. Torrey of the Los Angeles Bible Institute seconded this idea:

Personally, I think it would be desirable, if possible, that there should be a new alignment of Christians. The old denominational differences have lost their significance. The alignment should be along the line of whether people accept the Bible as the inerrant word of God or not. Those that do not should get together, irrespective of present denominational connections, and form a new denomination, and those who do should get together and form a new denomination.

Thus far had the gulf between the two parties widened!

⁹ *The Fundamentals: A Testimony to the Truth*, Chicago, Testimony Publishing Co., n.d., I, 100.

¹⁰ This and the three following quotations can be found in E. C. Vanderlaan, *Fundamentalism versus Modernism*, New York, The H. W. Wilson Co., 1925, pp. 361, 395.

The liberals agreed that there were two versions of the faith in conflict. Harry Emerson Fosdick noted that "two conceptions of the church are in conflict today in modern Protestantism, and one of the most crucial problems of America's religious life in this next generation is the decision as to which of these two ideas of the church shall triumph." Henry Sloane Coffin spoke for most liberals in insisting that the two camps ought not to divide. "There seems to be room for both types in the church, and each needs the other," he declared. "Both bear witness to God's presence with them in consecrated lives, and both belong in the one body of Christ. It is time for mutual forbearance, for an effort calmly to understand each other; above all for the recognition that both must hold together if the church is to fulfil her task of redeeming the world to God." But even as they argued for an inclusive policy, liberals accepted the definition of the situation which saw Protestantism divided into two factions.

The struggle between the parties raged in the 1920's with much bitterness. The story of the fundamentalist effort to win the denominations has been told from the liberal point of view by Stewart G. Cole, and recently from the viewpoint of a general historian by Norman F. Furniss.¹¹ A number of organizations, the most conspicuous perhaps being the World's Christian Fundamentalist Association, were formed to assist the effort. In five denominations especially—Northern Baptist, northern Methodist, Presbyterian U.S.A., Disciples of Christ, and Protestant Episcopal—the struggle was keen. In southern areas fundamentalists were at their strongest; their ability to secure the passage of legislation in four states prohibiting the teaching of evolution in public schools paved the way for the celebrated Stokes trial in Tennessee in 1925, at which William Jennings Bryan and Clarence Darrow locked horns. As the struggle continued, the real theological situation was obscured as middle ground between the contending factions was lost from view. I have suggested that there were at least five theological parties—modernists, evangelical liberals, conservative evangelicals, strict conservatives, and fundamentalists. As the conflict became acute, the middle parties tended to divide in support of one or the other extreme; Protestantism seemed bifurcated into fundamentalism and modernism. In the heat of battle the extremists had their opportunity.

By 1930, however, it was clear that the fundamentalists had failed in their attempt to drive the liberals out. Fundamentalists survived as a minority party in many denominations, while many others withdrew to form independent churches and splinter denominations.

¹¹ Furniss, N. F., *The Fundamentalist Controversy, 1918-1931*, Yale University Press, 1954.

The whole controversy can be seen at least in part as one of the consequences of the dichotomy between faith and reason, between pietist and rationalist, in American Protestantism. Evangelical liberalism was an attempt to bridge the gap, but for lack of practice and experience it went too far, and instead of bridging the gulf it too easily leapt it and too easily accepted the standards and ideals of the surrounding culture.¹² In reacting against the liberal effort, conservatism also went too far, and saw in the new movement only an old enemy and missed the point that despite its excesses it was a genuine apologetic effort. As it was expressed in *The Fundamentals*, "If we have any prejudice we would rather be prejudiced against Rationalism. If we have any bias, it must be against a teaching which unsteadies heart and unsettles faith."¹³ The controversy was another round in the long struggle between faith and reason.

V

Since 1930 the theological climate has remarkably changed. A theological renaissance in Europe and America has been transforming the Protestant atmosphere. The theological revival is a complex movement; its best-known exponents have often disagreed sharply among themselves —one need only mention the names of Barth, Brunner, and Niebuhr. It is a many-sided movement that has influenced all serious religious thinking, cutting across party lines. Such a conspicuous liberal as Harry Emerson Fosdick could reveal how the new atmosphere was influencing him in a famous sermon of 1935, in which he said:

We have adapted and adjusted and accommodated and conceded long enough. We have at times gotten so low down that we talked as though the highest compliment that could be paid to Almighty God was that a few scientists believed in him. Yet all the time, by right, we had an independent standing-ground and a message of our own in which alone is there hope for mankind.¹⁴

The theological renaissance has been furthered by the ecumenical movement, and today has touched Protestant thinking everywhere.

In terms of the polarization of Protestantism that has been the focus of this paper, the theological revival can be seen as a fresh attempt to bring together again the intellectual and emotional aspects of Protestant life, an effort to bring faith and reason together again in creative interchange. It cuts across the gulfs that have long divided us. The primacy of faith

¹² Cf. Hudson, Winthrop S., *The Great Tradition of the American Churches*, Harper & Brothers, 1953, especially chapter IX, "The Church Embraces the World: Protestantism Succumbs to Complacency."

¹³ I, 119.

¹⁴ Quoted in Schneider, Herbert Wallace, *Religion in 20th Century America*, Harvard University Press, 1952, pp. 107f.

is stressed, but the contributions of biblical and historical scholarship are accepted. The basic unities and unique dimensions of biblical faith are strongly asserted, but the historical approach to the understanding of the Scriptures is taken seriously. The authoritative nature of the revelation of God through Christ in the Bible is affirmed, but mechanical and legalistic doctrines of plenary verbal inspiration are rejected.

The movement is, as its name implies, unashamedly and self-consciously theological—sometimes, I fear, pridefully so. It seeks to recover the great words of classical Christian faith—sin, grace, justification, redemption—yet strives to avoid static and outmoded theological formulations that have outworn what usefulness they may have had. The theological renaissance in its manifold forms is concerned with expressing the gospel of Christ in terms relevant and convincing to men of our time, yet is keenly aware of the dangers of minimizing the profound and unique dimensions of the faith by trimming them to suit the whims and prejudices of any given cultural period. It seeks to use the instruments and insights of twentieth-century scholarship and science to understand most fully the Christian message, yet is sure that the faith is the gift of the Eternal God and stands above us and the best of our human devices. Therefore it cuts across the theological divisions of American Protestant history; it both challenges some and confirms other of the central tenets of the various positions of yesterday.

Those who stand in essential continuity with the theological extremes of past feuds can scarcely appreciate the hope the theological recovery offers for transcending some of the tragic dichotomies of the past. To men of fundamentalist bent this whole movement seems but a new modernism, while to those who claim continuity with modernism it appears only as a new orthodoxy. But to the bulk of American Protestants—liberal, evangelical, conservative—the many-sided movement of theological revival offers hopeful prospect. It is significant that one of the denominations (Northern, now American Baptist) which had been most sharply torn by the Fundamentalist-Modernist controversy was able a year ago to hold a theological conference in which fruitful discussion among the various theological parties could be held in an atmosphere of warm fellowship. Many issues were sharply debated, but the debate was for the most part constructive and creative. The wide gulfs that have for so long divided Protestants may significantly be narrowing, as faith and reason are coming into a more creative interchange.

Biblical Theology and Philosophy

RUSSELL F. ALDWINCKLE

I

WHAT PRECISELY IS MEANT today when scholars speak of the revival of biblical theology? At what point in time did this revival begin and wherein does it differ from theological thinking which preceded this revival? The time has come to take stock and evaluate this revival of biblical theology. The more enthusiastic exponents sometimes speak as if all who wrote before 1918 were woefully ignorant of even the most obvious features of biblical thought. Systematic theologians of previous ages are dismissed as men who had no sense for the living and dynamic quality of biblical religion and substituted for it a mere arid and sterile scholasticism. Great biblical scholars and thinkers of the nineteenth century are dismissed with something not far from contempt. It is assumed that the modern emphasis has simply rendered out of date and hopelessly passé those troublesome problems which bothered the liberals so unnecessarily, such as the relations of science and religion and the problem of miracle. The more ignorant believe that the new emphasis on biblical theology means that the critical and historical approach to Scripture has been abandoned and that we can fall back comfortably upon a biblicism of personal preference. That this is muddle-headed and mistaken does not alter the fact that this is how some are reacting to the situation.

This problem cannot be considered without reference to the geographical situation and the cultural background of the thinkers concerned. In Europe, including England and Scotland, all the major Christian theologians and biblical scholars are agreed that whatever else biblical theology may mean, it does not and cannot mean the abandonment of a sane biblical criticism which aims to discover the date, authorship, historical context, and cultural milieu of the various writings which compose the Bible. "The application of critical principles and critical methods to the Bible can only be set on one

RUSSELL F. ALDWINCKLE, D.Th., is Associate Professor of Systematic Theology at the Divinity School of McMaster University, Hamilton, Ontario, Canada. His aim is not to attack biblical theology, for the revival of which we are all grateful, but to stress the need for an adequate philosophical justification of the use of biblical categories by modern men.

side by a sacrifice of intellectual integrity which would infallibly stultify any attempt at theological reconstruction.”¹

Dr. Manson here speaks for all the leading biblical scholars of today whose names are closely associated with this new interest in the theological interpretation of the Bible, such as Eichrodt, Cullmann, Rowley, and Dodd, to mention only a few. Karl Barth is no exception. “I have nothing whatever to say against historical criticism. I recognize it and once more state quite definitely that it is both necessary and justified. My complaint is that recent commentators confine themselves to an interpretation of the text which seems to me to be no commentary at all, but merely the first step towards a commentary.”²

It is worth dwelling on this aspect of the matter because it signifies something new and revolutionary in Christian thinking. Many, particularly in America, thought in the early days that Barth stood for a revival of fundamentalism. His basic position in regard to biblical criticism is now better appreciated and has led Van Til to describe his theology as the “New Modernism.”³ Barth has made a decisive break at this point with the assumptions which governed Calvin’s thinking about Scripture.

This means that biblical theology today is the result of the experience of those men who have passed through the critical phase and come out on the other side (so they believe), with a firmer grasp of the true nature of biblical thought, without abandoning their critical methods. Rather they have applied them more intensively and freed themselves from certain presuppositions which belonged to nineteenth-century culture, but which did not form a necessary part of the critical method itself. No true estimate of biblical theology today can be made without the full realization of the acceptance of the critical method, whatever limitations this latter may have. The so-called liberal thinkers have been treated with something like disdain because most Christian thinkers have felt confident that the battle for freedom of investigation has been so soundly won that there is no danger of losing it again. This optimism, however, may be premature. A narrow kind of fundamentalism is very much alive both in America and even in some parts of Europe. The more scholarly conservative theologians, such as Augustus Strong and B. B. Warfield in America and Auguste Lecerf in France, would have us return to Calvinist assumptions, which are not really compatible with the modern approach to Scripture.

¹ Manson, T. W., “The Failure of Liberalism to Interpret the Bible as the Word of God,” in Dugmore, C. W., *The Interpretation of the Bible*, S.P.C.K., 1944, p. 101.

² Barth, K., *The Epistle to the Romans*, trans. by E. C. Hoskyns, Oxford University Press, 1933.

³ Van Til, C., *The New Modernism*, Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1947.

Modern biblical theology, as we have been thinking of it, is really something new in the history of the church because it is attempting to combine loyalty to a sane criticism with a sincere desire to listen to the Bible as the Word of God. Origen was aware of the problem and solved the difficulty in what was perhaps the only way open, namely, by means of allegory and typology.⁴ Luther was surprisingly open-minded in regard to some problems of date, authorship, and spiritual value because he himself felt secure in the authoritative nature of his own personal experience of Christ. Yet the systematic application of the critical method really begins only in the late eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, and has gained wide acceptance among Christian scholars only within the last two or three generations.

There are some who sympathize with the new emphasis of more recent years, not because they have passed through the intellectual catharsis involved in the critical method and have discovered that God still lives and speaks, but because they see in it a means of undermining entirely the whole critical approach and leading us back to the infallible authority either of Book or Church or Pope. It is because of this ambiguity that it is vital to determine precisely what is the contribution which modern biblical theology has made.

II

Why did so many Christian scholars, educated in their younger years in the critical method, come to feel dissatisfaction with the results of their efforts, particularly since the turn of the century? The reasons are not mainly or chiefly academic. The first major reason was the deepening conviction of the impotence of man in the face of the national and social conflicts of the twentieth century. As it became ever more clear that modern man was not going to evolve by easy and steady stages to the perfect human society on earth, the reduction of the gospel to ethical idealism seemed to supply no dynamic for a robust Christian faith when temporal things were being so rudely shaken. Modern man, suffering from cosmic loneliness and social cataclysm, began to experience a deep longing for a new assurance. How could he be sure of the objective reality of a God of love and power who transcended the limitations of human finitude and was not entangled in the frustrations and sins of twentieth-century man?

This was not simply a failure of nerve, as some humanists would have us believe, but sprang from a more realistic understanding of the human

⁴ Daniélou, J., *Origène*, Paris: La Table Ronde, 1948. Lampe, G. W. H., "Typological Exegesis," in *Theology*, Vol. LVI, No. 396. Wright, G. E., *The God Who Acts*, S.C.M. Press, 1952.

predicament and of human need. It therefore became, to use the modern jargon, an existential question to find out, if at all possible, whether God has really made himself known to man. Human discovery and intellectual endeavor began to take second place to the more imperious urge to discover if God has *revealed* himself. The modern biblical theologians believe that honest and unprejudiced application of the critical method has led them to such an objective revelation, the gift of God rather than the product of human thought. We shall try to examine the validity of this claim.

At what point did the "liberal" theologians of the nineteenth century go astray? When and where did they take the false turning which led to an emasculation of the gospel and the elimination of the Savior, truly God and truly man?⁵ Dr. T. W. Manson thinks it was "when the working hypotheses of natural science were allowed to become the dogmas of theology."⁶ This not only eliminated miracle in the narrow and somewhat loose sense of a "breach of the natural order." It also made impossible God's activity and intervention in his own universe. Manson speaks of the soundproof, plate-glass window set up between heaven and earth and the steel and concrete order of nature.⁷ The effects of these assumptions on biblical theology were disastrous, because they meant a plain denial of the total biblical view of the nature and activity of God and of his relation to the world.

While Dr. Manson is entirely accurate in seeing here reason for the distortion of the biblical revelation when studied with such "*prejudicia*," does he do justice to the motives which led these thinkers to effect this compromise in the interests of a reconciliation with modern science? After all, many of them believed that the modern scientific view of the world and intellectual honesty compelled such a course. How far has the more recent emphasis of biblical theology solved the problem? Even if we assert that science has moved on since the nineteenth century and that scientists are no longer so dogmatic, he would be a bold man who claimed that there was still no tension between the scientific *Weltanschauung* and the biblical view of God and the world. Of course, the problem can be solved by saying, so much the worse for science! this is what the Bible says, and that is final. However out of date we may consider Harnack's statement, quoted by Dr. Manson, that "there can be no such thing as miracles,"⁸ many modern

⁵ It is not fair to couple together Strauss and Harnack. The former reduced Christianity to mythology, the latter gives us at least a Christ of incomparable moral grandeur.

⁶ Dugmore, C. W., *op. cit.*, p. 101.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 95.

⁸ Harnack, A., *What Is Christianity?* 2nd Edition, revised 1901, G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1904, p. 28f.

scientists still find themselves in considerable sympathy with Harnack, and even an Anglican bishop can reiterate it.⁹

The point of this discussion is not that Dr. Manson is wrong in his delineation of the biblical point of view, but that the mere assertion of the latter does not solve the problems raised by modern science—unless we fall back upon a simple appeal to biblical authority, which Dr. Manson is precluded from doing by his critical method. Karl Heim has recently charged that “the main school of Protestant theological thought maintains an attitude of critical aloofness and declares that the entire discussion is out of date.”¹⁰ Yet, as he rightly insists, whether the discussion is admitted to the syllabus of the theological schools or whether it is conducted outside the boundaries of formal dogmatics, discussion between Christianity and the scientifically educated world must and will be carried on.¹¹

Harnack and the rest may have been wrong in coming to terms prematurely with the still developing science of the late nineteenth century, but they did not evade the problem altogether. The new biblical theology cannot evade it either. This means that we still need a “philosophy of revelation.” Some biblical theologians today seem to think that the more adequate understanding of the Bible which is now ours has made precisely that both impossible and unnecessary. Philosophical and scientific questions need no longer trouble the intellectual serenity of the truly biblical theologian. Dr. Manson is right to urge that theology must go on with its proper task of studying God’s self-revelation in the world and history without constantly looking over its shoulder to see if it is in agreement with the latest deliverance of the natural sciences. Nevertheless, the latter cannot be ignored. In fact, Rudolf Bultmann, though reckoned one of the leading biblical theologians of today, appears ready to give away far more than Harnack ever did, if we take his demythologizing seriously.¹² We can only avoid a drastic reduction of the gospel à la Bultmann by boldly coming to terms with the philosophical and scientific issues, and not pretending that the mere proclamation of “biblical theology” is an adequate defense.

III

Let us now turn in greater detail to a number of questions which urgently require an answer. When we speak of biblical theology, what do we mean by the Bible? No Christian scholar today questions the fact

⁹ Barnes, H. E., *The Rise of Christianity*, Longmans Green, 1947.

¹⁰ Heim, K., *Christian Faith and Natural Science*, Harper & Brothers, 1954, cf. Preface.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, cf. Preface.

¹² Bartsch, H. W., *Kerygma and Myth*, trans. by R. H. Fuller, S.P.C.K., 1953.

that the Bible did not fall down ready-made from heaven. We know that the literature was the product of a long period of history extending from remote antiquity to the second century A. D. It is also common knowledge that the Jews did not finally set aside their sacred writings in a closed canon of Scripture until the beginning of the Christian era¹³ and that the canon of the New Testament was not closed until the fourth century.¹⁴ It is equally well known that there is an important difference between Roman Catholic and Protestant in regard to the Apocrypha, the former holding that these writings are inspired Scripture, the latter reverting to the narrower canon of the Hebrew Old Testament as established by Palestinian Judaism. Evidently some position must be taken up in regard to this question before the phrase "biblical theology" can be given any precision.

How did a group of writings come to be set apart in the first place as a canon, a corpus of authoritative writings for the Christian world? Dr. H. Wheeler Robinson declared that the "authority of the Old Testament canon has rested from the beginning on value-judgments made by the synagogue and accepted by the church."¹⁵ A. H. McNeile wrote of the New Testament that "the books made their own place by a process which can be called, on the whole, the survival of the fittest, so that they were gradually set apart from all others as containing the sacred message of God."¹⁶ Though he uses different language, it is clear from his whole treatment of the matter that McNeile would have accepted Wheeler Robinson's statement as true also for the New Testament, but this time it is the value judgment of the Christian community in the early days of the church's development. This way of stating it raises some rather acute problems, particularly for the Protestant, for it means that the "church" precedes the Bible, and the setting apart of such documents in a canon appears to rest on the subjective approval of men, dignified by the name of value judgments. Yet there seems to be no escape from the conclusion that this is in fact how the canon of Scripture came to be formed.

Leaving on one side for a moment the vexed question of the Apocrypha, let us ask the question: What is the basis of the canon's authority for the believing Christian, assuming the former account of its formation to be substantially true? There seem to be a limited number of answers to this question:

¹³ Robinson, H. W., *The Old Testament in the Making*, Hodder & Stoughton, 1937.

¹⁴ McNeile, A. H., *Introduction to the Study of the New Testament*, revised by C. S. C. Williams. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1953.

¹⁵ Robinson, H. W., Ed., *Record and Revelation*. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1938, p. 306.

¹⁶ McNeile, A. H., *op. cit.*, p. 372.

1. Since the church created Scripture, the church is the final and authoritative interpreter of its content. This raises the further question, Through which organ of the church is this interpretation given? Is it a general council, or a meeting of representative theologians, or a majority vote of all believers in good ecclesiastical standing, or the infallible Pope?

2. The Bible is an infallible, verbally inspired and supernaturally dictated collection of oracles in which there can be no error. How is such a judgment reached, ignoring for the moment its truth or falsehood? Do I believe it because some church group has told me so? In this case, we are back at some variation of the position described in (1). If this is not the ground, then the only other alternative is to say that I believe this because this is what the Bible is and claims to be. Since all are not agreed, however, on this point, it can only be because I have made a personal value judgment to the effect that the Bible is an infallible book. Thus, what at first sight appears to be a theory securing the "objective" authority of Scripture turns out in effect to be another exercise of private judgment, whether this latter be identified with the inner testimony of the Holy Spirit or not.

3. The only other position is to say quite frankly that "divine authority must always rest at last on the authority of intrinsic character—what God is in Himself."¹⁷ Church and Scripture must remain secondary in the final analysis. This does not mean unimportant, for they constitute indispensable media through which God makes himself known to us and their massive authority and effect for the thoughtful Christian must be immense. Finally, however, it is only because the truth, which comes to us through these media, convicts me and elicits a personal response, which is my apprehension of the truth, that I find an absolute authority, the authority of truth itself (not purely intellectual). Such truth, however, must not be interpreted in narrowly intellectualistic terms or as a system of theological and doctrinal propositions. "The authority of the truth is as objective as anything in human experience can be, for the truth is that of the activity of divine love, the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ and the fellowship created by the Holy Spirit."¹⁸

IV

Let us examine these positions in turn, bearing in mind continually that the question to which we seek an answer is the nature of the ultimate authority which biblical authority exercises over us.

¹⁷ Robinson, H. W., *Record and Revelation*, p. 306. Cf. also Payne, E. A., *Henry Wheeler Robinson, A Memoir*, London: Nisbet, 1946, p. 179.

¹⁸ Payne, E. A., *op. cit.*, p. 179.

1. *Church, Tradition, and Scripture*

The historical fact that the church preceded Scripture and was responsible for the canon has been used in some quarters to restate and defend the principle of ecclesiastical authority, whether in its Roman form or some attenuated or less consistent version of it. This, however, will not do. A brilliant and original defense of the Protestant principle that Scripture remains an authoritative norm for the Christian has recently been made by Professor Oscar Cullmann of Basel.¹⁹ He does not dispute that the church herself created the canon, but maintains that by "establishing the principle of the canon, the Church recognized in that very act that *from that moment the tradition was no longer a criterion of the truth.*"²⁰ If we accept in any sense the authority of the church, it means that we accept her decision in regard to Scripture, and this decision sets definite limits to the interpretative role of the ecclesiastical tradition.

Scripture itself enshrines the genuine apostolic tradition which the church herself has decreed to be the norm for her life. The supposition that the church can go back on this norm, and develop practices and dogmas incompatible with this early decision of the believing community, is both illogical and futile. If the church was mistaken in establishing the canon of Scripture, we cannot now turn to her for authoritative guidance in setting up another norm to supersede the earlier one made in error. If the early decision was not an error, then the church and tradition must be subject to the authority of the scriptural norm. "By what we may call an act of humility, she submitted all subsequent tradition to be elaborated by herself to the supreme criterion of the apostolic tradition, codified in the Holy Scriptures."²¹ The problem of authority, therefore, remains for the Christian the authority of Scripture.

2. *The Infallible Book*

No attempt will be made here to repeat the reasons which have led an increasing number to abandon doctrines of plenary and verbal inspiration and an infallible Scripture. When we have admitted the excesses of a Baur and maybe of a Bultmann, the fact remains that the most sober and constructive biblical critics are against such a view, for the very cogent reason that it fails to do justice to the content and claims of Scripture itself.

¹⁹ Cullmann, O., "Scripture and Tradition," in *Scottish Journal of Theology*, Vol. 6, No. 2.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 127.

²¹ *Ibid.*, p. 127.

3. *Authority of Intrinsic Truth*

Our third position, that divine authority must rest finally on the authority of intrinsic character, the fusion of objective and subjective in personal experience and faith, will be defended in more detail later. Let us turn first to consider the biblical view of God and man and their relationships which is given us in the most notable biblical theology of recent years.

It is not surprising that the first result of critical and historical study was to underline the diversity of the biblical writings. That such diversity was a fact could hardly be otherwise, when it is remembered that in this literature we have the deposit of more than 1,200 years of history. Wherein, precisely, does the unity consist? This question again falls into two parts. Is there a unity of the Old Testament and of the New Testament taken as separate bodies of literature? Secondly, is there a still deeper unity which comprises both Testaments? Is there a Bible and not simply *biblia*?

Biblical theologians of various shades of opinion seem to be agreed in giving a definite affirmative answer to all these questions. The unity, however, is not the unity of formal doctrine and theological proposition. It is the unity of a changing but consistent purpose of God himself as he works out his plan in this *Heilsgeschichte* which includes the old Israel after the flesh and the new Israel after the spirit. One of the chief contributions of biblical theology has been to restore to us the actual event and the living experience which lie behind the systematized theologies, both Roman and Protestant. Wheeler Robinson reminded us that if the content of the divine revelation is described "topically, and not chronologically, as a 'theology' requires, they become still more abstract and remote from the once-living, vibrating and dynamic religion of Israel."²²

What, however, is the justification for affirming such unity? Behind such a simple question lurk some of the most baffling and difficult issues. How do we arrive at historical truth, and what is meant by "truth" in this connection? What is the relation between historical truth and the Christian affirmation that certain historical events are charged with transcendent meaning, are indeed the eternal God revealing himself in space and time? How do we know that the latter is not a reading into history, prompted by subjective desire and hope, rather than a true description of the actuality of history as it really is? What is our justification for isolating a certain stream

²² Robinson, H. W., *Inspiration and Revelation in the Old Testament*. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1946, p. 281.

of historical events and treating them as salvation-history? Very few biblical theologians have even attempted to give any defense of this latter position, except to infer that because the Bible says so, then it must be so. But this is philosophical dogmatism in biblical garb. Yet where there is so much difference of opinion, one can only describe with becoming modesty the situation as one sees it.

V

It seems to me that we must accept Eichrodt's contention that there is no such thing as a history of Israel's religion without presuppositions.²³ Every historian must perforce adopt some principle of selection before he can even begin to thread his way through the maze of historical events. He does not simply read and study his inscriptions, monuments, documents, etc., using them without further ado as "authorities" which guarantee the "facts." "The historian is his own authority and his thought autonomous, self-authorizing, possessed of a criterion to which his so-called authorities must conform and by reference to which they are criticized."²⁴ Whence does the historian draw his principle of selection? What is the basis of what Collingwood calls his *a priori* imagination, with the aid of which he reconstructs the past? Whence does the biblical theologian draw the criterion by which he asserts the unity of the Bible in any sense?

Evidently he believes himself to know what Cullmann calls the central point of history, by the light of which B.C. and A.D. are illuminated and seen as part of a consistent divine purpose.²⁵ This central point is Christ as known through the apostolic witness and grasped afresh by the biblical theologians through the insight of faith guided by the Holy Spirit. Now, what is the authority for selecting Jesus Christ as the supreme criterion by which all history, past, present, and future, is to be measured? The only answer can be that the biblical theologian enjoys an actual and present experience of God, through his response to God's activity mediated through the Bible and known in the continuing fellowship of the church. He is able to say "Jesus is Lord" because Jesus elicits from him a total response of faith which involves a series of value judgments which come to him with the force of intrinsic truth.

The historian finds his criterion, then, in those value judgments which he makes here and now in pursuit of his historical activity. These judgments

²³ Rowley, H. H., *The Old Testament and Modern Study*. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1951, pp. 322ff.

²⁴ Collingwood, R. G., *The Idea of History*, Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1946, p. 236.

²⁵ Cullmann, O., *Christ and Time*, trans. by Floyd V. Filson, The Westminster Press, 1950.

are in part logical, moral, esthetic, and spiritual. They involve his total response to the universe and the significance of what is going on in it. Yet why should he trust these value judgments, and how does his writing of history differ from that of the novelist or the creative artist who is not tied down to the facts in this sense? The only *rational* defense of such value judgments lies in a metaphysic which offers a coherent account of the universe, including values. They are to be trusted because man is a rational creature made in the image of God, living in a world created by an intelligent and purposive being. In other words, the selective principle of the historian demands for its final justification a metaphysic. Without this latter, his value judgments become simply the assertion that "this is how it appears to me." Biblical theology, therefore, raises questions the ultimate issue of which is a metaphysic which refuses to sunder reality and value.²⁶

Few biblical theologians have clearly recognized this fact, and some speak as if biblical theology had rid us once and for all of any troublesome mixing of theology and metaphysics. Here rise the shades of Tertullian and Ritschl, not to mention Barth and Brunner, who are anything but shades. Nevertheless, H. Wheeler Robinson, who was assuredly a biblical theologian, saw this clearly. Some metaphysic must be worked out in which philosophical justification is given for some "correspondence between the human and suprahuman realm," if our symbols are to have any real meaning outside our experience. This presupposes some measure of spiritual kinship between God and man.²⁷ "Personal conviction not welded by thought is no more than prejudice, and philosophy is ordered and systematic thinking about the value and truth of life."²⁸

The value judgments which lie at the root of the response of faith are not therefore to be dismissed as subjective in the derogatory sense, as if this were a case of reducing religion to the mere play of human fancy. Whatever Ritschl may have meant by the term, any sane philosophy must presuppose the "objectivity" of our value judgments. To attempt to secure the objectivity of faith by appealing to infallible Book or Pope does not really escape the charge of subjectivism, for a thought which is critically aware of its nature and its assumptions. Barth once told us that we cannot get to God by shouting man in a loud voice. It is equally true that the mere proclamation of "Revelation" cannot give any rational assurance of

²⁶ Cf. Urban, W. M., *The Principle of Valuation*, Allen & Unwin, 1909; *The Intelligible World*, The Macmillan Company, 1929; *Language and Reality*, Allen & Unwin, 1951.

²⁷ Robinson, H. W., *Redemption and Revelation*, London: Nisbet, 1942, p. 52.

²⁸ Payne, E. A., *op. cit.*, p. 139.

objectivity. If our judgments of truth, beauty, and goodness do not give us any reliable knowledge of the real world, then Bible, church, and personal faith must be pronounced to be without any rational validation. *Credo quia absurdum* becomes the only logical alternative. The biblical theologian is really saying: I believe because I believe, and if you cannot share my belief, I cannot offer any reasons why you should. It is either your personal misfortune, or maybe God never predestined you to believe anyhow. Much written in the realm of biblical theology today has no clear grasp of these distinctions, and the appeal to biblical authority really rests on a covert fundamentalism incompatible with the methods employed in the study of Scripture.

Historical study cannot make any pronouncement of ultimate validity which belongs to the province of philosophy and theology. Nevertheless, the biblical historian cannot be purely objective in the sense of working without any guiding ideas. He can, however, suggest that when working with certain ideas and value judgments, he is able to offer a more coherent and satisfactory account of the period of history with which he is dealing than if he worked with a different set of judgments. Eichrodt has achieved considerable success with his use of the covenant idea as basic to a true understanding of Israel's history. This, in turn, offers valuable suggestions for a metaphysic of value, which must among other things give a satisfactory account of what we call history, including Israel's history, wherein value is actualized in and through the actions of free beings.

VI

Biblical religion has a dynamic character. As we have already seen, there is more or less general agreement today among biblical scholars that in the Bible we have to do with a living and active God. Here is no "*dieu des savants et des philosophes*," no hypothetic First Cause or rational Ground of being. Yahweh, even when the cruder anthropomorphisms have been refined away through the influence of the great prophets, remains a Person with clearly defined characteristics. His relation to the world and man is not easily fitted into modern philosophical terminology. Yahweh is certainly transcendent in the sense that he is not imprisoned in his own universe or limited by it, but he is not the far-off detached god of deism who, like an engineer, watches from a distance the working of his own created machine. On the other hand, Old Testament thinking about God never seems to have reached a conception of the divine immanence in the

sense familiar to modern philosophy influenced by biological evolution and its renewed grasp of the reality of process.²⁹

C. Ryder Smith suggests that the analogy of the Emperor in his relation to his empire, purified and enlarged, probably best expresses how the Jew thought of God's relationship to the world and to men. Nevertheless, Yahweh is actively present in history and continually shows his character in the events and personalities used by him since he established the covenant with Israel. The term "ethical monotheism" certainly sounds too abstractly philosophical to describe adequately the continued activity of the holy and righteous Yahweh of biblical history. Nevertheless, this emphasis upon the dynamic and living cannot be used to evade the philosophical issues.

A great deal of nonsense is often talked at this point through a failure to appreciate the role of philosophical thinking within the total life-context of an individual man. A philosopher who never prays, never attends public worship, never serves his fellows by any act of love and sacrifice, is obviously a man who has never really "known" the God of biblical religion. He may rightly be accused of sacrificing vital religion to an "empty ballet of bloodless categories." The problem, however, is not so simple. The tension between living religion and the demands of the intellect is a tension within one and the same individual, not only between different people. It is this problem which many biblical theologians seem to overlook, and therefore give the impression that biblical theology is another short cut to certainties based on emotion rather than a faith which is a total response of the whole man in which the intellect is a real and legitimate factor. There are, no doubt, "simple" believers in whom the biblical experience of God is reproduced in a living manner with no attempt to mold it by thought or express it in a coherent philosophy, however unsophisticated. It is true that without the Jeremiahs and the Bunyans, living religion would atrophy into dead intellectual formulae. But even the thinking of these men was not so devoid of intellectual content as some would suggest. In any case, the history of the church surely proves that without the constant activity of the intellect in "scrutinizing" immediate experience, Christianity would have degenerated into a hopeless mixture of truth and superstition.

²⁹ Smith, C. Ryder, *The Bible Doctrine of Salvation*, Epworth Press, 1946, p. 97.

Political Morality and the Businessman

KERMIT EBY

FOR QUITE A WHILE I have known a liberal scholar—liberal in the old-time sense of the term—who conducts his life and interprets his politics in terms as strict and high-minded as those of Joseph Conrad, who wrote of nothing but the moral problem in the heart of man. The name of my scholar friend is Max.

I also know Max's son, who is a sociologist where his father is strictly, and perhaps narrowly, a historian. The son of Max is also a liberal, perhaps even a bit of a radical. But the son and the father would disagree on their interpretations of both political and personal relationships. The father talks in terms of "betrayal," of "cowardice and courage," or "integrity," of "progressive" and "reactionary." And the language of the father is meaningless to the son, who speaks of the "reality principle," of "aggression" and "neurosis," "rigidity," and "compulsion." The son and the father are fond as fond can be of each other, but they live in essentially different worlds of terminology. The interesting thing about their two different worlds, however, is that they are not so different after all. The father and the son are motivated by many of the same feelings, desires, dreams, and ideals. Only where Max would label these feelings, desires, dreams, and ideals "heart," the son would call it the "unconscious."

I have been thinking about Max a lot lately, about that intense sensitivity he feels concerning violations of trust, about the firm and manly ideal of right and wrong he held (as his son might say, "rigidly") for himself, the careful way he selected his few close friends, and how he had no patience for the all-pervading "getting ahead" type of gregariousness which is too often the identification of the modern American businessman.

Because, you see, only by avocation is Max a scholar. He makes his living as a businessman because, years ago, not having enough money for higher education, he was denied his choice in the matter and went into that line of goods by which he could support himself and his family.

I think of Max often, as I say. I think of him whenever I get into a

KERMIT EBY, A.B., is Professor of the Social Sciences at the University of Chicago, and was formerly Director of Education and Research for the CIO. He points out various paradoxes in our social and political morality.

group of people where I hear arguments like, "We should help the Negro get full rights in the United States *because* it's good business, and *besides* it would be nice if we did treat these people right," or "Let's give labor a chance to bargain *because* it is good business, and *besides* they deserve some consideration." I think of Max when I hear these things, and of how Max would not think very highly of these people, who, as he would judge, have neither *principle* nor *heart*.

Because sometimes I agree with Max, and sometimes with his son. Sometimes I am torn between the unilateral morality of Max, and the more complex philosophy of his son, who somehow cannot bring himself to use the word "morality" at all, who would say that the line between right and wrong in certain situations is too subtle, too thin.

Some time ago I set out on a trip between two large cities, and in the course of my trip I sat beside a traveling salesman named Alan Howard. Howard, like many of the businessmen I know, turned out to be an excellent companion, intelligent, alert, a man who told me that he could sell goods only if he believed in what he was selling. A. Howard had been to Persia and to Europe, and we talked of many things.

Now A. Howard was very worried about the state of the American nation, which he said was corrupt: dishonest politicians, dishonest businessmen, dishonest wives, dishonest revenue collectors, and the all-pervading power of the dollar. A. Howard, who was a Republican in politics, believed that the only cure for this general malady was a return to the golden age of Victorian morality, or to the era when the embattled American farmer stood proudly on his plot of land with a long rifle.

Somehow A. Howard reminded me of Max and his unilateral morality. And much as I admired Max, and amiable as I felt toward A. Howard, I wondered again whether their basic premise was correct. I wondered even more when, in the course of the conversation, A. Howard stated that perhaps the most efficient way to handle Russia would be to drop the atomic bomb *first*. (This was a statement that Max would never have made, because Max could not believe that naked power solved much of anything in the end.) I thought that such a statement was an inconsistency in the otherwise high ideals to which A. Howard held.

Yet despite their dissimilarities, the basic beliefs of both the salesman and the liberal avocational scholar were the same. They both presumed that politics is beyond honor (and this was their reason for not participating in it); they also assumed that the current value structure does not accept the

service motif, and that they, because they believed in service, were lonely, incorruptible individuals in a sea of unscrupulous entrepreneurs.

It was on these presumptions of theirs that I have begun to disagree; I might even side with the son of Max, who does not believe that the caucus in itself is wrong or immoral, but only the absence of our own smoke among that of the others in the caucus.

This is true, in my experience, of every situation in which people deal with other people in a group situation. It is true in unions: not malice aforesought, so much as the psychological climate of defeatism and its attendant laziness, opens the breach for racketeering and communism in unions. Because both racketeers and communists are willing to work very hard for power, and the majority of members are perhaps not willing to work at all.

I think that I would agree with those who say that on every level—from the level of simple neighborhood gossip to the more advanced plane of diplomatic international rumor—“life is politics.” But most often we forget that the politics of life is never played by any one person for exactly the same ends as any other. The categories which might be made here could only in a generalized way cover the specifics: politics is played for money or prestige, for fame or power, for love or contentment, for adventure or for peace of mind. And most of us play our big or little games for a combination of these things.

But quite a few of us play a pretty confused game. The reason for our confusion seems to be that in our country we have developed a highly complex and opposing set of values, a set of values which often tends to bring on moral schizophrenia in the highest circles.

How many times have I sat through one of those mixed business-social luncheons, and how many times have I heard coming from an otherwise shrewd and intelligent person, the old cliché about it being important that “business comes first.” Even as he uses his professional weight to get good jobs for his friends, even as he is an indulgent father and husband, even as he is many things, it is still possible for this kind of man to kid himself into sincerely stating that with him business always comes first. The implication of this is as unilateral as the philosophy of my friend Max. The businessman says that no game is worthy unless it is played for profit, and Max says that no game is worthy unless it is played for principle.

This is sheer nonsense. Because Max is a human being, a man of strong emotion, desire, impulse, love, and hatred; and every businessman

or politician I have ever known—including the most self-admittedly corrupt and smooth—were also men of irrational emotion, impulse, love, and hatred. Max cannot possibly live purely for principle, any more than those others whom he condemns can possibly live purely for profit. Ed Kelley, of the infamous Kelley-Nash machine, was estimated to have stolen something like a million dollars; and in his latter days he spent much of it in strangely charitable ways, for in the end he wistfully desired to be remembered for his good works.

But at least Max, who follows his code of honor as carefully as possible, is more at ease with himself than a lot of well-placed businessmen and politicians whom I have met, who have contracted the American disease of moral schizophrenia. This schizophrenia has many forms: the same man who wants to drop an atomic bomb on Russia organizes charities for the support of European refugees; the same man who has used all the known tricks to get ahead in the corporation will start reading books on mental hygiene and peace of mind because he has a feeling that it is his *moral* duty to be happy before everything else, and he can't be sure what happiness is; the same lawyer who tells you that he is in business only for profit, joins service clubs and gives generously to all kinds of causes and feels very good about doing this because it provides him with the dedication that he would never admit needing.

Moral schizophrenia has many forms indeed. In American high schools the football star hero is urged and cajoled to go into universities which buy him outright. Most of us know of this buying and selling, and we forget about it as long as we can see our favorite teams play, but we are genuinely shocked when we open our newspapers to the West Point scandals. In the same manner, our schools preach the brotherhood of man to our children, and after four P. M. send them back into a society where Negroes on many levels, and Jews on others, are simply not accepted.

We are brought up on the belief that every man can make good, and, indeed, has an obligation to make good (making good might be equivalent to acquiring prestige or money, or getting a nice home, or running for President after being born in a log cabin.) And in the same breath, from the same moral authorities, we are told that our primary duty is to be happy, and that if you aren't happy there is something surely wrong with you. (The implication that always follows this second teaching is that happiness has *no* connection with the size of your bankroll or your position with the boss.)

The result of this is that we believe at one and the same time in the myth of Horatio Alger and in the sad folktale of the poor little rich girl; we believe that it is a necessity to be successful at any cost, and we also believe that the misery of Willie Loman in *The Death of a Salesman* was caused by adherence to false values. (The false values being just that pursuance of success to the destruction or negation of all other ends.) We believe that America is built on the idea of advancement by merit and by merit only, and yet we believe in the books which tell us to develop a "nice" personality and a pleasant smile in order to make the road to advancement more than a trifle easier. We believe that the tough-minded thing to do would be to drop the atomic bomb on Russia, and we enjoy weeping at the tragic end of a love story projected before us on the movie screen. So that a man working for a corporation made prosperous by the production of armaments, meeting a friend on the street, sympathizes with him quite sincerely over the loss of a son in Korea, and hopes with fervor that the war will end soon.

We also seem to believe quite sincerely in the distinct separateness of mind and heart. Thus we would think, as part of our national myth, that a good businessman cannot let his "heart" get in the way of his business, or he will cease to be good financially. We have the feeling that efficiency is never compatible with enjoyment, so that there always seems to be a struggle going on in America between the managers who would make people efficient and the simple man who does not know what efficiency means but who likes to go fishing on Sundays, and who enjoys an amiable world where the traffic cops are always willing to fix his parking ticket.

I speak from experience when I talk about this pleasantly corrupt, amiable man in the street, because in a lot of ways I am one, too. A long time ago, during the last war, I was invited to speak at Wittenberg College. A certain local businessman of the town where the college was located wrote me three letters asking me to have lunch with him. (I was in politics in those days myself, working for a national union organization.) During lunch, this businessman explained himself this way: "I am a manufacturer of vaults. I have been in business for thirty years. I have 127 employees, and I make the finest *steel* vaults in America; these vaults are rustproof, airproof, earthproof, wormproof. Nothing since the Egyptian method of embalming equals the kind of service represented by my vaults. However, because of the war and steel shortages, I have been forced to turn off some of my employees, some of whom have twenty years of seniority. Furthermore,

I have a competitor in this town who makes cement vaults. These cement vaults are infinitely inferior to my steel ones. But—what can you do?"

I waited expectantly.

"By the way," he said, "do you happen to know anybody in the steel business?"

I was just about to reel off a list of names, when he interrupted gratefully, "If you ever need a vault, just let me know. . . ."

It was not ethics that stopped me, you understand. It was the strangely unattractive idea of being paid off in vaults. Now if he had been in the automobile business, I would have consented far more readily to his request.

In this respect it seems to me that we Americans are not unlike the inhabitants of other nations, where a long period of corruption is periodically followed by a Puritan regime of efficiency, by reformers who would either change people altogether or make them much, much better. Robespierre, the "sea-green," the "incorruptible," was the head of this kind of Puritan revolt party after the French Revolution of 1789; the same kind of group led the Russian revolution of 1917; the official Puritans of Cromwell's regime were succeeded in turn by another monarchy corrupt beyond the original. The "simple" man-in-the-street, who *likes* to be sloppy, inevitably throws off the yoke of those who would purify him; and, at a certain point, when his sloppiness seems to threaten the body politic, he cries out vigorously for the yoke to be put back on. (And, strangely enough, this is not all to the bad; because if there is any hope that the present-day Russian regime will not be able to perpetuate a thoroughgoing 1984 upon its people, such hope lies in the fact that people remain people, by the simple mechanism of human inertia refusing to be pressed into a mold of inhuman efficiency which is alien to them.)

As for our own country, I would agree with those who say it would be difficult for us to become more corrupt. A wealthy country is always subject to corruption, and America, riding the crest of prosperity, is no exception. But I would not agree with those who believe that we need more Puritans to stem the corruption. We already have a plethora of efficiency experts, time-study men, homegrown Stakhanovites, and corporation executives who are wedded to their jobs every waking hour and for a lot of uneasy sleeping ones, too. There is nothing wrong with the Puritan and the efficiency expert as such; they are useful commodities in schemes of action. The chief difficulty with them is that more often than

not they are set upon pulling or pushing recalcitrant people into *their* scheme of things.

No, we do not need more moral indignation in this country; we already have a great backlog of that, and, as I see it, it has come for the most part to naught, as naught as Carrie Nation's well-remembered crusade against the bottle. We applauded the Kefauver committee, condemned the Pendergast machine, and elected Harry Truman, indelibly marked with the stamp of Pendergast, to the presidency.

We do not need more moral indignation which begins as high-flown and impossible idealism and which ends, quite often, in the disillusion of the rawest kind of cynicism. We do not need more efficiency experts, either, because America has long ago proved her ability to *get things done*; I am not so sure that she has proved that she knows what she is doing.

What we do need is practical, working idealism, which can be translated into terms of action.

For this job I would address myself, today, in our era, to businessmen. I would talk to businessmen especially, because I think that they represent an important, specialized group; I would single them out also because, for years, along with the rest of the American public, they have been looking down their collective noses at the professional "politician," that despicable creature whom they blame for all of our contemporary ills. (During the late days of the New Deal, businessmen also looked down their noses at "professors," mostly, I think, because they seemed to be blaming college men for "dirtying" their hands with political work.)

I would address myself to businessmen because, finally, after twenty years of decrying the corruption of the Democratic regime, they have been put most decidedly in charge of the new Republican order of things. In other words, they can no longer rest content in the role of critics, even though midterm elections have partially rejected their leadership, but must now take up the challenge of national governmental responsibility. There are those in the Democratic camp today who are predicting corruption to come from the new regime more high-powered than anything dreamed by the perpetrators of the Teapot Dome scandal. If this happens, then indeed the business interests in the United States will have forfeited any right they have to moral leadership, and perhaps the professors will be reinstated as guardians of the national soul.

Businessmen who would seriously consider their new-found responsibility would do well, I think, to re-examine the confused welter of cultural values which I have described in the foregoing pages. And in order to face

the facts of modern-day American life realistically, they would have to stop glorifying the little boy who grows up to be President and, instead, start suggesting to their sons that perhaps the precinct captain has a position worthy of being filled. They should have to stop condemning corruption in government on the one hand, and on the other hand, privately over their dinner tables, making it plain that in business everyone is entitled to get their cut, no matter in what way they get it.

And, beyond this, if businessmen are really and truly interested in clean government, they would start looking for ways and means to make it possible for men of lower-income groups to go into politics without being subsidized by their families. They would also begin to study the facts of voluntary organization: that in a democratic society you just do not get all, a majority, or even a fair-sized percentage of the members of any given organization to come to meetings. So that the best thing that you can do is to build up a core group of small, local leaders: the precinct captains, the union stewards, the community councilmen, and yes, even the ward heelers. And this is just about the only way you will really begin to guard yourself against dictatorship.

It is perhaps the only way that we have a chance of training a core group of fairly dedicated and decent men to take over the responsibilities of government. Henry Adams, grandson of Quincy and great-grandson of John, repented for three decades in sad and beautiful prose that his time was out of joint, because a man like himself, who had been groomed in training and integrity for governmental service, could not possibly get elected by popular vote.

Henry Adams had a point. After his time it has become more and more difficult to go into the American diplomatic service unless you have an inherited fortune to start out on. Adams had a fortune, interestingly enough, and both talent for the profession and dedication. What he did not seem to understand was the need for setting up a system by which men with talent and dedication but without money could be interested in doing more than play around at politics.

And, again, if we were really serious, we would face the facts of life: that no democratic government is ever going to be *really* efficient; governments have proved efficient only at suppression. And that, furthermore, if government has any value at all, it lies in the betterment of *people*, not in the setting up of paragons of institutional efficiency and economy.

It is my contention that there is no reason why the angels of light should not be as shrewd and well-informed as the angels of darkness. I do not know

why bad men necessarily drive out good ones in government or in anything else—unless the good men are too sanctimonious to study the tactics of Talleyrand in order to understand how the more brilliant of their opponents work.

It is also my contention that moral schizophrenia and the departmentalizing of the head and the heart will get us nowhere. If we are ashamed to admit that we have feelings as well as profit "motivations," then we ought to stop being ashamed, because in the end such an attitude is as self-defeating as it is self-unaware.

Our moral schizophrenia is even more disturbing than our self-unawareness. Because it is not so much our attempt to buy friends which makes overseas peoples so angry at us, but our hypocrisy. It is not the fact that we play power politics, but the fact that we refuse to admit to ourselves that this is what we are doing.

Perhaps eventually we will stop whispering about our everlasting conscience, and start doing something about what we would believe, or pretend to believe. And, if we do that, we might come to the conclusion that robber barons and mellowing bandits have quite often a strange desire to be remembered by their good works.

Simone Weil and Metapolitics

ERNEST WALL

SIMONE WEIL WAS BORN in 1909, and died in 1943. Like other significant women who left their mark on this century,¹ she died young. She was born of Jewish parents, lived in France, briefly visited America, and died in England during the German occupation of France. She was a genius. That is revealed in the various fields of her intellectual achievements—literature, languages, history, and philosophy. All her teachers were amazed at her intelligence; but it is in the mystical realm of insight, religious and social, that she made her greatest contribution to the thought of the world.

Her intellectual avidity became apparent at an early age. When six years of age, she could quote from memory whole passages from the classical works of the French dramatist, Racine. At fifteen she obtained the Lycée degree of Baccalauréat ès Lettres, with honors; and, by her comprehensive learning, she astonished the President of the Board of Examiners, who was himself a specialist in the literature of the Middle Ages. At twenty-two she was a fully qualified teacher of philosophy, and was appointed as such to a secondary school for girls. Her main interest, however, was not the past but the present; she did not lose herself in barren speculation, but concerned herself with active participation in the problems of the moment. Always, and as if John Donne's assertion "No man is an island . . ."² were written on her heart, she sought to escape from the isle of intellectualism, and join the mainland of human life and need and perplexity.

This led her into what appeared to be questionable activities. She rebelled against the officious regulations of her school authorities. She saw no reason to obey their ban forbidding any expression of sympathy with "the unemployed." She joined a group which published a radical magazine called *The Proletarian Revolution*. At times she gave up her school-

¹ E.g., Soeur Thérèse, Katherine Mansfield, Winifred Holtby, etc.

² "No man is an Iland intire of it selfe; every man is a peice of the continent, a part of the maine; if a clod bee washed away by the sea, Europe is the lesse, as well as if a Promontorie were, as well as if a manner of thy friends or of thine own were. Any man's death diminishes me because I am involved in Mankinde. And therefore never send to know for whom the bell tolls. It tolls for thee."

ERNEST A. WALL, M.A., B.D., Ph.D., is Minister of the Bay Ridge Methodist Church, Brooklyn, New York. In this article he treats of the effort of this gifted French-Jewish saint to "mend the breach between politics and Christianity."

teaching in order to engage in more manual labor, and so to experience other aspects of human life and expression. One summer she worked with laborers in the fields. One winter she became a factory worker in the Renault automobile plant. In the fateful year 1936³ when the new prelude to world war, the Spanish Civil War, broke out, she went to Barcelona in order to experience the struggle between the Francoites and "the workers." Nevertheless, all these adventures and other eccentricities of conduct—her support of radical causes, her unorthodox Marxism, her rebellion against human distinctions and discriminations, her asceticism, her effort to taste all the ingredients of the cup of life—were the impatient attempts of an imprisoned spirit to understand the purpose of life, and discover some satisfying solution of those tragic human problems which were the supreme preoccupation of the first half of the twentieth century.

It was providential that in 1940, as a result of the German occupation, she moved from Paris to Marseilles. It was now that she made her serious encounter with religion. A friend introduced her to the Dominican priest, Father Perrin; who in turn introduced her to Gustave Thibon, a lay theologian of the Catholic Church. In his introduction to Simone Weil's book *Gravity and Grace*, M. Thibon tells of the letter he received from Father Perrin, introducing this young Jewish girl, and of his first unpromising impressions. Soon, however, he sensed her deep mystical nature, and was compelled to say, "Never have I felt the word 'supernatural' to be more charged with reality than when in contact with her."⁴

It would probably be correct to say that this sense of the infinite, this mysticism which emanated from Simone Weil, manifested itself increasingly during her last three years of earthly life. This is revealed in her writings, published posthumously: *La Connaissance Surnaturelle*, *Waiting for God*, *Gravity and Grace*, and the book written during her last year on earth, *The Need for Roots*.⁵ This latter book contains more than the educational and political recommendations she was asked to submit for the consideration of the leaders of the Free French in England. Actually it is a philosophical consideration of man's essential needs; and, read in conjunction with her other work, it furnishes a picture of the soul of a modern saint who while being deeply mystical was, as all true saints have been, passionately interested

³ It was also in June, 1936, that the "great unrest" was manifested in a big "sit-down strike," when important factories and industrial plants in France were occupied by dissatisfied employees. See the discussion on p. 196, *The Need for Roots*, tr. Arthur Wills, G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1952.

⁴ *Gravity and Grace*, p. 5, tr. Arthur Wills, G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1952. (Also tr. Emma Craufurd, Routledge, 1952.)

⁵ *Waiting for God*, tr. Emma Craufurd, G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1951; *The Need for Roots*, tr. Arthur Wills, G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1952.

in human politics and social problems. Indeed she was concerned to mend the breach between politics and Christianity. She earnestly believed that the pre-eminent need was to baptize politics into a high and holy relationship with religion, in order to achieve the true welfare of man.⁶

It is clear from her writings that she felt that the primary mistake of human government was the separation of the secular and the sacred. She felt that any regeneration of human society could only be effectively accomplished by a re-establishment of unity between these two instruments of social progress. This necessity has been envisaged before; but Miss Weil's conception of the unity of religion and politics had nothing in common with the official Roman Catholic idea—the supremacy of the ecclesiastical hierarchy in politics as well as religion. She does not advocate the political principle that the state is subordinate to the Church; nor does she offer the solution of Dante that each, pope and emperor, church and state, is supreme in his or its own orbit. She knows that the secret of social redemption does not lie in politics, not even in a church-dominated politics. Her solution for the achievement of the requisite unity has more in common with the action of the saints than with the dogmas of the Church. That is to say, her way to unity is mystical and spiritual. It is a method, influencing and fashioning; a power, spiritual in essence, social in intention, that we may call "*metapolitics*."⁷

Much of the theology of Miss Weil is not of a character to call for our attention. She was not a theologian; and in her French environment she was confronted with a religious temper compounded of Catholic arrogance and general religious immaturity. This was unfitted to lead such a lofty seeker. She never joined the Catholic Church; but she experienced God. However, her great contribution lies not in her intellectual understanding of God, so much as in her deep understanding of man. It was this which inspired her social passion; but it was her mystical religious soul which led her to envisage that spiritual political power and activity which we are calling "*metapolitics*."

To understand this term we begin, of course, with the word "politics." Any true definition of politics reveals the fact that, like many another empire of man, politics has had a "decline and fall." Originally, politics comprised the wise and prudent pursuit of ways and measures to promote the public welfare and prosperity. This laudable objective, however, came

⁶ For further facts about Miss Weil's life see *Waiting for God*, the biographical note on p. vii f. and "Her Life," pp. 13-39.

⁷ This is not Miss Weil's word. It is used by Leslie A. Fielder in his introduction to *Waiting for God*, but defined as "a politics of the absurd." My use is not exactly the same, as is made clear in the text.

to be overshadowed by what appeared to be a greater end, namely, the devising of schemes for national aggrandizement. As this aim assumed pre-eminence, it was easy to conclude that "the end justifies the means"; with the result that moral considerations were brushed aside by shrewd policies; and politics became a game in which the most cunning devices were sought and accepted—if they promised a sure means of preserving the safety or enhancing the grandeur of the state. The final step was inevitable. The once pure and single social objective became inextricably mixed with certain hopes of personal aggrandizement and gain.

The relation of metapolitics to politics may be illustrated by the relation of metaphysics to physics. Metaphysics probes beyond the physical, beyond nature to first principles. It seeks to reveal the underlying constitution of nature. It is concerned with the ultimate ground of being. It is a means of reaching back beyond the material to the reality of things. In like manner, metapolitics not only goes back to the original intention of politics, but first considers what is the essence of public welfare and prosperity. It is in the light of this that the nature of metapolitical action is determined. Let us try to systematize this social philosophy of a modern saint by considering what was to her (1) a new Vision; (2) a new Way; (3) a new Power.

I. A NEW VISION

Inherent in Miss Weil's mystical vision of appropriate social aim and action is Meister Eckhart's judgment that it is characteristic of God that he cannot refrain, but must beget his Son in us all.⁸ If this spiritual end is the primary intention of God, it should also determine political objectives. The clarity of Miss Weil's vision of social intention is seen in her declaration that the great sin of social injustice lies in the fact that it impairs personality. For one thing, it renders persons self-concerned and incapable of self-renunciation—that full expression of consecration to the will of God which makes us willing to become reflectors of God.

Therefore, the needs of the soul are supreme. Only man has an eternal destiny, and all things which concern public welfare and prosperity must be judged in the light of this distinctive human dignity. For instance, the questions must be asked: Do they give or detract from human respect and freedom? Are they aligned with Truth, which is the sustaining bread of the soul? It is the absence of Truth from human life which permits the sway of evil; and this absence has allowed the erection of "*four obstacles*"

⁸ Eckhart had to face charges for teaching such mystical insights. His defense may be seen on pp. 296-7 of *Meister Eckhart*, by Raymond B. Blakney.

in the mind of man which bar human society from experiencing a worthwhile civilization: *Our false conception of greatness; our degradation of the sentiment of justice; our idolization of money; our lack of religious inspiration.*⁹

This vision of Simone Weil was not the imaginings of an impractical dreamer. It was more than philosophical curiosity which, during the Spanish Civil War, took her to Barcelona to share in the sufferings of the Republican Army. She saw a glory in suffering for an ideal—even greater than in the actual realization of the ideal. Indeed, it was better to be a sharer in the Cross than a victor on the Throne. Nevertheless, she felt the utter calamity of war, and recognized the benefits of social amelioration. It was never right, she asserted, that, because of political ineptitude or social negligence, people should be oppressed by excessive fatigue, harassing money worries, lack of true culture, or should know want, strife, or violence. However, she is equally sure that the mere absence of these human limitations would not of themselves facilitate the perception, let alone the achievement, of the divine ideal for human personality. In theory, better wages, less working hours, lighter burdens, and national peace should give the opportunity and lead to the desire for true culture; but in experience, these things fail to bring to men the true welfare of the soul.

According to Miss Weil's vision of the ideal, our goal is not success or prosperity, or even happiness; indeed, the very opposites of these are often essential ways to God. Moreover, it is in satisfaction with these lesser goals that our political and social, as well as our personal, danger lies. In one striking passage¹⁰ she condemns both the selfish "I" and the social "We": "It is wrong," she says, "to be an 'I.' It is worse to be a 'We.'" What she means is that there is a unity above the social, a "belonging" above the membership of any group. Our goal is a unity which is born of the consciousness of "the All"—the allness of humanity and the allness of God; it is a sense of being part of the universal Whole.

Simone Weil's interpretation of the social and political goal exposes the possible blinding power of any and every social body demanding absolute loyalty, whether it be Church¹¹ or State. Too frequently such institutions fashion a partisan spirit and blind the moral sense, by exacting an obedience or inspiring a patriotism which transcends conscience. Mere politics fails because it so often acquiesces in this usurpation of authority; and Miss Weil

⁹ *The Need for Roots*, p. 219.

¹⁰ *Waiting for God*, p. 22.

¹¹ Unless distinctly stated, she means by "Church" the Roman Church.

cites such examples as the Crusades, the Inquisition, the burning of witches, the torture of heretics, and (a more general manifestation of this allegiance to a lower social ideal) the tendency to fight for what our group or church or nation holds supreme. Too many great souls, even great saints, have been tainted by this kind of social bias. They have energetically engaged in the defense of a partial goal; and this has displaced their loyalty to Truth, and influenced their judgment of right. Human loyalty must be to the Whole; nothing partial and partisan must pre-empt that devotion.

One may say, therefore, that to Simone Weil the social goal was actually a transcendence of the social. She believed that the temptations of our Lord in the wilderness revealed that the social is the domain of evil; and that the way the kingdoms of this world become the kingdoms of our God is not by way of politics, or conquest, or the adding of one kingdom or social realm to another. To realize the goal we must first recognize that evil is in social life because it is in personal life; and the secret of evil in personal life is the sin of disobedience which has placed man outside the current of infinite power and good. Everything which happens to us is the result of this personal alienation; for all things obey God—excepting man.

This spiritual alienation of man has resulted in evils which are not so trivial that man with man can rectify them by battle. Evil is spiritually caused, and can only be spiritually healed. The ills of society, therefore, are not capable of being rectified by a mere increase of human activity on the social and political level. They demand increased spiritual effort; and, for this, man must be brought back into and at-oned with the current of the Infinite—the current of that Power in the universe whose badge is obedience.

Thus metapolitics reveals that the change needed in human life and human affairs is an achievement which must be sought in a sphere above the level of the physical, in which politics works. Metapolitics becomes important when we realize that politics, labor concerns, the application of science to human physical needs, even social service—though all are good—work on a lower level of good. It is this which makes them partial and incomplete, and, consequently, ineffectual and slow. Metapolitics becomes reasonable when we see that “brute force” is not sovereign. *Limit* is sovereign; and this, physical forces, considerations and objectives have to obey. By “Limit,” Miss Weil refers to Divine Providence; and her interpretation of this doctrine has to be taken into account when attempting to understand her sense of the need for a higher, holier, more effective instrument of human social redemption than that which politics alone affords.

To Miss Weil, God's providence is not so much a private personal matter as an inherent law of the universe which reveals God as Sovereign Justice, Eternal Wisdom, the Agent of Balance or "Limit." Divine providence, therefore, does not imply that whatever happens or does not happen is by order of God. It means that God sets limits beyond which evil is powerless. "Eternal Wisdom imprisons the universe in a web of determinations."¹² Thus Good, as the final goal, is assured. This, of course, does away with the ideas of a struggling God, an eternal Adversary, and a cosmic battle of Good and Evil. Evil is wholly on the human level; and the victory of Good is wholly spiritual. It consists in the alignment of man with the Holy One; but in this battle we need not fear the outcome. We can trust the Good. We can depend on the invincibility of right. Beyond every visible evil or adverse force is the invisible Limit; and the new way of metapolitical reconciliation and devotion can close in the limit of how far any evil may go.

Thus her faith in Divine Providence, which is faith in the predominating and restraining goodness of the universe, is immensely important to the idea of social redemption by means of metapolitics. It puts the whole subject into its true and larger context. We are all too prone to see evil—whether it be in personal, social, national, or international life—on a restricted canvas; and this supersensitivity to the immensity of evil and its power causes the diminishment of our consciousness of the larger invincible good of the universe in totality. Hence we know fear, the haste of alarm, frenzied effort, and the impotence of bewilderment.

A true view of Providence gives a larger, more assuring view of God. It helps us to eliminate our anthropomorphic ideas which limit God to the point of making him vulnerable to the attacks of evil. The struggle with evil may look as perilous for Good and God as it is for us; but its menace concerns only Good and God in man. "Metapolitics," therefore, is the philosophy of the assuring vision. By it we see the true nature of the battle for social redemption; and because of it we become confident that, though we fall, or political schemes and social plans fail, Truth is such, Good is such, God is such, that ultimate failure is impossible.

II. A NEW WAY

One might say that the new way of social control and social change which Miss Weil came to see was, in essence, the Mystic Way. She does not say this, though she declares that "Mysticism is the only source of value

¹² *The Need for Roots*, p. 285.

for humanity";¹³ and she is quite emphatic that "the fate of the world is decided out of time."¹⁴ Therefore, to take part in the essential fight of the political and social arena, we must cultivate the timeless experience, and rely upon the timeless Patience and Power. It will be well, then, to begin by endeavoring to understand her own term for this new Way: "The Duty of Acceptance."

Acceptance of the higher way of metapolitics is not easy to human pride. We see social evils, and are constrained to champion a cause, or party, or idea, and seek victory; but in thus winning, we defeat both ourselves and our aim; for it is human nature to look down upon the defeated. This kind of victory merely feeds our pride. "Acceptance" implies seeking the *total* good; for it is the recognition that, while our desire for a revenging justice may be truly a quest for social equilibrium, yet because we are liable to error, we cannot safely seek this, except on a higher plane. Therefore we are to identify ourselves, neither with the victorious nor the defeated, but with the Eternal who declares, "I will repay." We can only control helpfully the total situation through union with the Omnipotent.

This duty of acceptance, therefore, forbids our championing one class, or one idea, or one aspect of Truth.¹⁵ The world, affirms Miss Weil, needs that universal love which is the genius of saintliness. Such dedication to the universal good springs from the sanctity of "acceptance"; for this mortifies all selfish or partisan love; and allows no prejudice to limit our sharing of the universal sweep of the infinite love of God. Jesus, we recall, included "enemies" in this sweep of love. Love is only divine, and therefore adequate, when it is an unselfish universal regard, free from sectarianism, racism, nationalism, and classism. Anything which hinders any person from appreciating the "wide as the ocean" love of God is wrong. The new Way thus demands that I cease to give way to any and every excuse for not loving others, for anything that limits love is not only wrong, but restrains the power of divine love in human affairs.¹⁶

This new Way, like the Mystic Way, may be represented as threefold.¹⁷ At least it implies a threefold expression of saintliness: *Humility*, *Incarnation*, and *Identification*. The "holiness of humility" begins in a deep consciousness of the magnanimity of God in bestowing upon man that experience

¹³ *Gravity and Grace*, p. 164.

¹⁴ *Gravity and Grace*, p. 33.

¹⁵ *Waiting for God*, p. 31. This explains why she refused to embrace the Catholic faith.

¹⁶ *Waiting for God*, pp. 150-151.

¹⁷ Miss Evelyn Underhill, in her work, *Mysticism*, speaks of mystic achievement as a trinity of experiences; an act of Love, an act of Surrender, and an act of Supreme Perception.

of divine indwelling and empowerment which Paul expressed in the phrase "Christ liveth in me." This produces such self-abnegation that "there is something impersonal and anonymous about us."¹⁸ We are then willing to accept all things, particularly the distasteful, and all people, as a test of our spiritual reality.

In the case of Simone Weil this "noughtness of humility" led her not only to embrace poverty and deprivation, and to share the perils of war, but to become a "suffering fool" for others. She embraced the Cross; so she forsook the abundance and security of America after a brief sojourn in New York. She went to England; but even in that land of wartime austerity she deprived herself of necessities in order to share the sufferings of her friends in France, and her health was mortally affected. These experiences, however, did more than reveal the measure of her endurance, or test the reality of her pure intention; they were gloriously transformed into spiritual signals and used, as Paul used the "marks" in his body, to call the attention of others to the transcendent kingdom of her faith, and enlist them to seek it.

This humility was also a purifying discipline. In Miss Weil the sense of universal obligation led to what was perhaps an exaggerated fear of all loving or friendly attachments to a few. It also did what it is always intended to do, it led to a sense of personal unworthiness, and a fear lest her life be no better than the barren fig tree, incapable of passing on to others the sweet assurance of the universal love and the beneficent purpose of God in human creation. This, whether in Miss Weil or in any other saint, is what permits and prepares for that divine incarnation, which conditions spiritual achievement.

By *Incarnation* is meant the revelation of the divine through men. And since it is the revelation of the divine through human society which alone will accomplish enduring social change, spiritual incarnation thus becomes a metapolitical instrument. How this incarnation of God in man will be revealed, is suggested in such a passage as that in which Miss Weil speaks of Beauty as an incarnation and revelation of the divine.¹⁹ For instance, she points out that just as the sun shines for all, and upon all, so beauty has no limiting purpose; it is there to bless all. It is this unlimited lavishness of the good will of God which we are to incarnate and demonstrate, by a universal, unprejudiced bestowal on life of all we are and have.

Christ's illustration of this spiritual incarnation was the allegory of

¹⁸ *Waiting for God*, p. 179.

¹⁹ *Waiting for God*, p. 177.

the Vine.²⁰ The end of this spiritual union is fruitfulness—social usefulness and effectiveness; but there is a vast difference between this way of Christ and the way most social enthusiasms take. Miss Weil suggests that by the New Commandment,²¹ Christ united what previously he had designated as two great commandments, so implying that to love God fully, one must either love total humanity without partisanship, or limit our experience of incarnation. Christ is “the light that lighteth every man”; and if, as George Fox would say, there is “that of God in every man,” our human concern must be universal; our endeavors must be truly catholic. The social intention of metapolitics is union with all, and the union of all. Thus Christian love is the incarnation of the divine concern and compassion. It is the undiscriminating love of God loving through us. True mystic union, therefore, must be with both God and man. Just as there is no forgiveness of God without forgiveness of men, there is no union with God without union with men. Divine incarnation has in view a redemptive *social* purpose, namely, the reconciliation of man with man, people with people, and the world with God.²²

Logically, therefore, the third step in this new Way is *Identification*. Miss Weil believed that her labor with people in the fields and the factory and her sharing of human struggles and sufferings identified her with the great anonymous mass of mankind. By these experiences, the affliction of others entered her flesh and soul. She lost her separateness and achieved a sense of oneness with humanity. She suffered what others suffered, and said, “By these experiences I received forever the mark of a slave.”²³ Thus this spiritual way of metapolitics does not dispense with any of the lesser instruments of social change—politics, labor reforms, the benefits of science, social services, etc.; rather these are all intended to be reborn as sacred activities, aligned to the holiest and the highest. Our failure is in making these things areas of conflict, and not channels of love. The primary struggle of society is in ourselves. It is the fight of faith—faith that must work by love in self-identification with human affliction.

All human activities, therefore, are to become religious; for all are sacred. The politics of righteousness and the labor of righteousness must be indistinguishable from the religion of righteousness; but when the politics and labor and the services are merely “profane,” they effect no permanent good. When they succumb to self-interest, self-assertion, self-aggrandize-

²⁰ John 15:1.

²¹ John 13:34.

²² *The Need for Roots*, pp. 97-98.

²³ *The Need for Roots*, p. 67.

ment, or mere moral (or even immoral) self-expression, they are limited and doomed. Only spiritual effort, God-in-us effort, can succeed.

III. A NEW POWER

After following Simone Weil so far, one reaches the conclusion that her aim is to set forth the thesis that *spiritual* activity is supremely necessary to effect *social* betterment. Her contention is that the power which will effectively change human social life is the earnest expression of the human spirit, when it is so integrated with God and man that it is wholly obedient and loving. Power begins to be generated when we personally rediscover, and possess, humanity's lost faith in the dazzling conception of a universe geared to the obedience of the will of God.²⁴

The failure of politics is that its activity is limited. By it "we attack in part," and so merely give cause to all the historic swings of the pendulum which human affairs have known down the ages.²⁵ We must learn to attack by way of self-union with the Whole; for it is to that Union all must be drawn. Thus we are to be magnets of spiritual power. To illustrate this spiritual magnetism which can redeem the world by drawing it to God, Miss Weil uses the story of the uplifted serpent in the wilderness.²⁶ In that bronze serpent which focused the attention of the needy, both Incarnation and Identification were typified. Our power is not so much in what we do as in what we become; and like the serpent, and like Christ, we must become the dwelling place of divine power, and the medium of divine grace.

The new Power, or new instrument of social change and control which Miss Weil presents, is the power of *holiness*—its rebuke, its restraint, its inspiration. What our world needs more than political technique or social action is a large but human expression of the divine holiness. The Christian political spirit must be the expression of a personal at-one-ness with the divine, and a personal self-identification with the human. Union with God, alignment with the eternal, is not the projection of my force on the side of God; it is a consecration, a submission, so that God may invade my world by invading me.²⁷ It is this indwelling of the Eternal, this self-surrender to the purpose of divine incarnation, which is the great redemptive and reconciling force in every realm of human life.

Naturally, all the "means of grace" are necessary if divine power is to be channeled by saintliness to human affairs. Like every other mystic,

²⁴ *The Need for Roots*, p. 290.

²⁵ *The Need for Roots*, p. 115.

²⁶ John 3:14.

²⁷ *The Need for Roots*, p. 291.

Miss Weil speaks much of prayer and communion.²⁸ The secret place of the Most High is the way to direct contact with eternal truth; and the redeeming power of truth reaches humanity through this personal experience. The way of social salvation lies, therefore, not in any secular collectivism—Fascism, Communism, Socialism, Capitalism—or even in some religious collectivism, Catholic or Protestant. We become saviors as Christ did, by the way of acceptance ("Lo, I come to do Thy will, O my God"), by a process of personal incarnation of the grace and power and holiness of God; and by a self-identification with man, which is controlled and conditioned and empowered by our consecrated integration with God. This oneness with the Divine Will was not made by Simone Weil in the seclusion of an ivory tower. "There is no quest without pain," said Suso, "there is no lover who is not also a martyr."²⁹ "Self-nouthing," as Saint Catherine of Genoa called humble self-subordination, is the way of transformation; and this, Miss Weil would add, leading to loving, even suffering self-identification with man, is the power of metapolitics and the way of social regeneration.

So Simone Weil suffered. She has been variously called "God's Fool" and the "Quixotic Suffering Friend of God." Her life was vicarious and her death sacrificial. She discovered that now, as at Calvary where Jesus cried "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?", God may bring his people to the impotence of despair; but the valley of humiliation is also the way of holiness. "The road to a Yea comes through a Nay";³⁰ this is the true way of power. Salvation does not come to man or society through strife or vainglory. Only the uttermost of self-abnegation is the prelude to the uttermost of social salvation.

"Our politics is in heaven," Saint Paul told the Philippians. The Christian intention is to bring the invisible into concrete expression, "Eternity into Time."³¹ We influence human life by the expression of unbounded faith and love; that is to say, by that spiritual activity which springs from an ever closer union with the Eternal Love. "Love is my vocation," said Soeur Thérèse; this also was the "supreme perception" and the quest of Simone Weil. Until death and beyond, she sought that mystical union which is love—a love-union with God and all mankind. Always she marveled at the wonder of Divine Love; its grace, its patience, its sheer undeservedness made her humble.

²⁸ *Waiting for God*, p. 105.

²⁹ Underhill, E., *Mysticism*, p. 222.

³⁰ Underhill, E., *Practical Mysticism*, p. 159.

³¹ *Ibid.*, p. 161.

"Love bade me welcome, yet my soul drew back."

Whenever security beckoned, the economic security of a teaching position, or the physical security of life in America during wartime, she drew back. Humility forbade that she should enjoy what most men could not attain. Her soul was "noughted," "decreated," and as Juliana of Norwich would add, it was "rested"—but only at the end. It was when she was dying that Simone Weil repeated the poem of George Herbert, "Love bade me welcome." It was only then that she could respond in the spirit of that poem's last verse. After a life of strange abstentions she was ready for Love's abode. She who had bid God enter, heard him now say, "Enter thou . . ."

*"You must sit down, sayes love, and taste my meat;
So I did sit and eat."*

"The Third Hour"

The Ecumenical Spirit and Christian Fellowship

MARIA FUERTH SULZBACH

I

MOST PEOPLE HAVE HEARD of the ecumenical movement and its efforts to reconcile the Christian churches through mutual understanding. The ecumenical movement is supported today by practically all the Protestant and Eastern churches. The recent assembly in Evanston has attracted world-wide attention.

This movement is also the subject of the present article. We shall, however, not discuss that phase of it which is organized and sponsored by the World Council of Churches and covered by the press, but rather another phase, the very existence of which is unknown to most Christians. We shall describe certain small groups of members of all Christian faiths—Protestant, Roman Catholic, and Orthodox—who meet on a friendly personal basis to discuss the religious problems which they share in common in order to foster the mutual understanding between the several churches and denominations and prepare the way for their hoped-for future unification.

Small groups have played a significant role in every period of Christian history. Their influence has sometimes been tremendous—not immediately, but all the more in the long run. It is the conviction of the present writer that the private groups, which are at this time active in the ecumenical movement, are making a significant contribution to Christian thought and action, which future generations will remember and appreciate.

One such group is called *The Third Hour*. The name was chosen in reference to the "third hour" of Pentecost, when the Holy Spirit descended upon the Apostles, endowing them with charity and the gift of tongues. The name "Third Hour" stands for a group of friends and for a publication. The latter appears at irregular intervals once a year or every second year, as funds permit. The first issue was published in Russian

MARIA FUERTH SULZBACH, Ph.D., author of several books in German, has been in this country since 1937, writing, teaching, and lecturing. Now resident in New York, she participates in the unusual ecumenical fellowship she describes in the present article. She is editor of the column, "Ideas and Opinions," in *Episcopal Church News*.

in 1946, the second in French one year later. All the subsequent issues are in English. They are edited and published in New York.

The Third Hour was founded by Hélène Iswolsky, whose own history reflects the influences of Orthodox Russia, Catholic France, and multi-denominational America on an open Christian mind. She was born in the Orthodox faith, the daughter of one of the most prominent civil servants of the last Tsar. Her father was at one time Russian foreign minister. He was Russian ambassador to France when the First World War broke out. Hélène Iswolsky subsequently became a Roman Catholic. Today she is an American citizen, a well-known writer on religious, cultural, and historical subjects, and a teacher of Russian literature in one of our big universities.

Hélène Iswolsky has been strongly influenced by the great Orthodox religious philosopher, Vladimir Soloviev, whose thought and very life revolved around the union of the Christian churches. She feels that Soloviev's influence on contemporary religious developments has been greater than even that of Dostoevsky and Tolstoy. Soloviev never tired of fighting the "selfish principle of division" which prevents the members of the several churches from feeling and acting as the children of God, in whom all of them believe. She was a personal friend of another great Russian philosopher, Nicolas Berdyaev, who died in Paris a few years ago. "All efforts toward a rapprochement and a union of Christian creeds, especially of the Orthodox and the Catholic, have until now met with no success," wrote Berdyaev. He added, "Particularly fruitless have been the efforts toward agreement by the church hierarchies."¹ A Protestant, Denis de Rougemont, has taken the same view. The ecumenical program, says de Rougemont, will remain a Utopia if the Christians depend on the churches to fulfill it.

The Churches as organized bodies can only support and frame Christian action, which will be implemented, as it has always been, by persons and by small groups, by some "exalted men," like St. Francis of Assisi; by humble people gathered in a room; by some mystics who seem of no importance; by men of whom it will be said that they exaggerated and dreamed, that they lacked common sense and saw too big. Perhaps by small periodicals like this one.²

THE EIRENIC MOVEMENT

Soloviev was the father of the so-called "Eirenic Movement." Its name denotes the Greek word for peace or conciliation. This group

¹ *The Third Hour*, 1947, p. 8.

² *The Third Hour*, 1947, p. 23.

originated with a group of priests and laymen, who often did not know of the existence of parallel groups who were working on the basis of the same ideas and ideals. Eirenicism aims mainly at achieving a better understanding between Roman Catholic and Orthodox Christians by way of an "inward reunion," a new attitude of mind. A book by the French Dominican, Father Congar, *Divided Christendom*, has become the model of eirenic thought. Theological, liturgical, and historical research has been promoted by the Dominican study-center *Istina* in Paris in an eirenic atmosphere. The movement has been encouraged by successive Popes, who suggested that Orthodox Christians who joined the Catholic Church should retain their traditional rites.

FRANCE

The attempts of small religious groups to foster Christian brotherhood have lately been particularly impressive in France, where reconciliation is, of course, in the first place, a matter between Catholics and Protestants. There are not many Protestants in France, but, though a minority, they are vigorous. They have outstanding leaders and their intellectual level is remarkable.

In few countries are the Protestants as much entitled to remember with bitterness what has happened to them in the past as they are in France. There was not only the St. Bartholomew massacre in the sixteenth century; there was Louis XIV's revocation of Henri IV's tolerance edict of Nantes in the late seventeenth century, which forced an estimated 400,000 French Protestants to emigrate to other countries. Religious intolerance was at that time an almost universal policy. However, the German Protestants, who were expelled by Catholic authorities, were acceptable in German Protestant principalities, just as expelled Catholics were accepted in German Catholic areas. English dissenters could emigrate to the colonies. But the French Protestants had no second France to shelter them. They had to turn to Britain, the Netherlands, or Prussia.

Times have changed since then. The old fanaticism has become a matter of regret and repentance. The Dominican, Father Congar, has found a particularly dramatic way to express his eirenic conviction. "During the sixteen years that I have been a priest," reports Father Congar, "I have celebrated mass on August 24th, the day of St. Bartholomew, in a sentiment of penitence. I know that a number of Catholic priests are doing the same." One of those to whom he refers was the Abbé Couturier,

a very prominent advocate of Christian unity. It has happened that on the same day of sad remembrance, a group of Protestants once dedicated a chapel to the victims of the historic massacre six miles away from the Catholics. "A few days later the Protestant minister and the Catholic priest met for the first time. Neither had heard about what had taken place in their respective parishes on that anniversary day. They learned it from each other and together they recited: 'Our Father'."³

Mention should also be made of CIMADE (*Comité Inter-Mouvements Auprès Des Evacués*), an organization that was founded during the last war to help in an emergency and has now gained ecumenical significance. It gives refugee students of all Christian faiths and of many nationalities an opportunity to gain an ecumenical approach. They meet, learn the doctrines of the various churches, study the causes of their separation, and are taught how to cooperate—all this under very primitive economic circumstances. No attempt is made at proselytism. A Yugoslav girl, the child of an Orthodox father and a Catholic mother, who had been baptized in both churches and was brought to CIMADE by a Swede, exclaimed: "I was born ecumenical. But not as the word is understood here. My childhood memories are of violence and hatred. Here for the first time I was taught the true meaning of the word 'Christian' and have begun to feel free. My year and a half in this community is the first good souvenir of my life."

One of the chief exponents of Catholic ecumenical thought and a regular contributor to the magazine *Dieu Vivant* is the French Jesuit, Father Jean Daniélou. *Dieu Vivant* is edited by Catholics, but publishes many Protestant and Orthodox contributions. Father Daniélou aims at a synthesis of the thought of great Protestants, such as Kierkegaard and Barth, of Catholic thinkers like Léon Bloy and Georges Bernanos, and of the Eastern Christians. He points out time and again that, as regards God's judgment and the ultimate penetration of the world by the light of Christ, Catholics and non-Catholics hold the same beliefs. To quote from his *Essai sur le mystère de l'histoire*:⁴

The Christian message transcends all temporal civilizations. Its task is to judge the world in the name of God. This is the origin of a prophetic and eschatological movement, in which great theologians and writers of all Christian denominations have participated. This movement can be found in each of the Christian churches. It unites those who adhere to it regardless of the church to which they belong.

³ Iwolsky, H., in *The Third Hour*, 1954, p. 8.

⁴ Paris, 1953.

CHRISTIAN FELLOWSHIP

The Third Hour likewise is a sort of workshop for men and women who are interested in the ideas and objectives which are common to all Christians. It reflects a persuasion which Tolstoy expressed not long before his death when he wrote to Gandhi, who was at that time active in South Africa:

Love, the aspiration of human souls toward unity, is the highest and the only law of life; it is realized and felt by every man in the depth of his soul, as we see most clearly in children. . . . This law was proclaimed by all the sages of the world, Indian as well as Chinese, Hebrew, Greek, and Roman. I think that it was most clearly proclaimed by Christ, who said that it contains all the law and prophets.

Among those who have contributed articles to *The Third Hour* are Nicolas Berdyaev; Dorothy Day, a leader in the Catholic labor movement; the Protestant writer, Denis de Rougemont; the Anglicans, Lord Halifax and Michael Scott; the novelist Julian Green, the poet W. H. Auden, and many others. The members of *The Third Hour*, who welcome everyone who sympathizes with their aims, meet from time to time for informal discussions and listen to speakers, who may report on contemporary developments within the various churches or on the activities of Christian missionaries or any other topic.

A few quotations from the several issues of *The Third Hour* will give the reader a further idea of its spirit and aims.

The French Protestant, Luc Estang, paying tribute to the late great Catholic writer, Georges Bernanos:

He [Bernanos] attacked only the human failings of the church. A Catholic preserves the latitude to recognize them even if they are manifested in the hierarchy whose spiritual dignity he venerates. He will suffer a little more because of these failings, that is all, because he will assume them, like Bernanos assumed the failings of all his brothers, examining his conscience through them: "When I speak of the Catholic masses," he said, "I judge myself with them, I am but a unit in the whole." For nothing in the world would he have accepted to be cut off from them.⁵

Alexander Schmemann, professor of Liturgics at St. Vladimir's Orthodox Theological Seminary, New York:

Everywhere and always, at each time and in every moment, the Christian is called to bring the spirit of Christ into all his deeds and into his entire life. But he can only do this inasmuch as the spirit of Christ is offered to him by the Church, where each is brought into communion with Christ. The Church is not a religious aspect of the world, not the fruit of man's striving toward God and of man's need of Him. The Church is first of all the manifestation of God Himself in the world, of

⁵ *The Third Hour*, 1949, p. 102.

God's Kingdom and of His power. Christianity is not a natural religion, "confirming" and "sanctifying" the world in its self-sufficiency; the Church is not an accumulation of spiritual energies for the building of a "Christian world." The Church is the manifestation in the world and for the world of that which is greater than it, outside it, of that which breaks up its limitations; the manifestation of the fullness of life in God, the kingdom of God Himself. . . .

In the light of Christ all that is of the world becomes "other," acquires a new meaning; everything is referred to the Kingdom to come and to life eternal. This expectation, this knowledge becomes the power of Salvation.

We have profaned the Sacrament. We invite the street into the temple and try in every way to please the street. We want to seduce the world with our rites, our beauty, our music. We have turned the liturgy into an advertisement of the Church. And the world finds in our temples everything—except Christ.⁶

Georges Tavard, a French Roman-Catholic priest who is at present working in New York and has recently published a book on Protestantism in French and Spanish:

There is no other course open to present-day Christians, both Catholics and non-Catholics, but deeply to suffer through their dividedness. Neither optimism nor pessimism, neither calls for reunion nor apathetic indifference holds the key to their future. The sole sharing of a truly Christian experience may be the common ground upon which God will reconcile them. The measure of their sufferings for Christian unity will define the value of their plea for joining together again in the one worship of the One God. It belongs to my faith to hold that the See of Peter shall be the center of their renewed brotherhood; but faith is dark as night: it tells us neither the date nor the means.⁷

The Third Hour does not advertise. It makes no propaganda. Yet it is steadily gaining ground, particularly among young people, and the increasing demand for its publications, the latest of which dates from 1954, is most encouraging. In the long run, the work of *The Third Hour* and that of other similar groups may have as much effect on the ecumenical movement as that of the famous world-wide organizations, about which everyone has heard and read.

⁶ *The Third Hour*, 1954, pp. 50f., 53.

⁷ *The Third Hour*, 1954, p. 62.

Recent Books on Jesus and His Ministry

ALEXANDER C. PURDY

“SINCE THE PUBLICATION of Schweitzer's *Quest of the Historical Jesus* (Eng. tr., 1910) and still more since the rise of form criticism a generation ago,” Lives of Jesus have ceased to pour forth in a “veritable flood” and now issue in “a slow stream, and recently . . . a mere trickle,” says Vincent Taylor on page 13 of his newest book, *The Life and Ministry of Jesus*. Taylor is aware that other than critical influences have determined the slow-down. The revival of theological interest as over against the exciting critical studies that absorbed attention for the first quarter of the twentieth century is perhaps quite as important.

Have we reached a kind of moratorium in critical studies? Dozens of questions about our sources remain unanswered, but no hypotheses seem at the moment to be insistent enough to challenge students in large numbers. On the other hand, the world situation calls for a more positive formulation of the Christian message. At any rate, there are more candidates for the Ph.D. in the field of theology and church history than in New Testament.

Why, then, are Lives of Jesus being written again? For there is some evidence of a still more recent trend in this direction. In this article we shall consider four works of the last year: the book by Vincent Taylor mentioned above, *Jesus and His Times* by Daniel-Rops, *Jesus and His Ministry* by W. E. and M. B. Rollins, and *Through the Gospels to Jesus* by D. W. Beck. In addition to these, as Beck points out (p. 82), “there are readable, popular yet scholarly studies by C. J. Cadoux, *Life of Jesus* (1948), H. E. Fosdick, *The Man From Nazareth* (1949), E. J. Goodspeed, *Life of Jesus* (1950), and A. M. Hunter, *Work and Words of Jesus* (1950), among which many might be named.”

All four books here reviewed appear to accept the basic principle that Christianity is a historical religion and that theology and historical criticism

ALEXANDER C. PURDY, B.D., Ph.D., is Dean and Professor of New Testament at the Hartford Theological Seminary, Hartford, Connecticut. In this article he treats of the following books: *Through the Gospels to Jesus*, by D. W. Beck (Harper & Brothers, 1954, xi-468 pp., \$5.00); *Jesus and His Times* (English translation), by Daniel-Rops (E. P. Dutton & Co., 1954, 615 pp., \$5.00); *Jesus and His Ministry*, by Wallace E. Rollins and Marion B. Rollins (The Seabury Press, Greenwich, Conn., 1954, xvi-299 pp., \$4.00); *The Life and Ministry of Jesus*, by Vincent Taylor (The Abingdon Press, 1955, 240 pp., \$3.00).

cannot be divorced. Christianity is a historical religion in the sense, not that it has a history, but in the sense that it is irrevocably committed to history. To quote Taylor again, "The Catholic faith rests upon Scripture, and what Christ did and taught is a fundamental concern of doctrine. It is time to cease girding at the older liberals, whose greatness, like good wine, needs no bush. If we do not like their constructions, we must take over their business under new management, for to attempt to expound doctrine without a scrupulous regard for the truth of the Gospel tradition is to build upon sand. Since Christology is inalienably bound up with history, we must descend to the basement and beneath to its foundations, even though the glory of the temple of faith is seen only from the skies." (pp. 18, 19.)

All four books assume also that a total view of the life of Jesus is essential if we are to appraise correctly the teaching and kerygma. Form criticism challenged the one outline of events we possess, Mark's, and left the impression that *sayings* of Jesus are more apt to be trustworthy than *narrative*, certainly than the Gospel sequence of narratives. This opened the door to such extreme views as that Jesus proclaimed a rigidly consistent eschatology or that he was a prophet and ethical teacher. Only a total appraisal of his life, these writers suggest, can properly orient the recorded teachings. Yet our authors have one eye on the Form Critics (even the Roman Catholic writer, Daniel-Rops), and they all resort to probabilities, to conjecture, or (in Daniel-Rops' case) to the authority of the Church, in reconstructing from our sources the Life of Jesus.

It is important to attend, at the start, to the declared purposes of the writers of these four books, for it is almost an occupational disease of reviewers to rebuke authors for not doing what lies outside their intention.

Beck writes "a beginning textbook for college study for those who have no knowledge of biblical languages or of the technical terms of theology." He also hopes that "any reader who desires to know how scholars study the Gospels and what are the results especially in recent years" will profit by it. He seeks to present as objectively as possible the varied interpretations of the records—Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish—without obtruding his own conclusions. In the preface he states his own viewpoint, "The method is historical, the viewpoint is liberal, the attitude is open-minded reverence, the aim is to understand the most important books in Christendom and to lay hold on the truth as it is in Jesus." The book admirably fulfills its intention, and one teacher of graduate students could wish that all theological students were conversant with its contents. Foot-

notes give extensive bibliographies. A unique feature is the use of the R.S.V. Gospel Parallels which the author follows, largely in the order of the sections.

The book by Daniel-Rops (Henri Jules Charles Pétiot) is difficult to bring on the same canvas with the other three. First published in 1944, and in its four hundredth printing in France, it now appears in English translation—the fifteenth language—and the excellence of the translation reveals the warmth, charm, and comprehensiveness of a literary masterpiece. Daniel-Rops is a devout Roman Catholic, although the book bears no imprimatur. The concluding paragraph of Appendix One, which is entitled "Jesus and the Critics," states the author's position. "We conclude this brief review of the 'liberal' critical approach to Jesus by advancing one last consideration: Jesus is a mystery, the mystery of God incarnate. Jesus is God made flesh: if this be accepted, everything else is clear. To those who reject this explanation, it is an incomprehensible puzzle, surrounded with every kind of complication which the human imagination can devise." (p. 610.) The last should have been first in this instance, for this sentence is, as might have been expected, the key to the author's entire presentation.

Note also Daniel-Rops' statement: "The Church has retained this tenet of evangelizing in Inferno (the descent into hell) in a verse of that Apostles' Creed which repeats old traditions. Thus it is part of the faith. We can only regret that the Evangelists . . . should have kept complete silence on the subject." (pp. 564, 565.) His use of ecclesiastical art and archeology is a valuable asset especially for the Protestant reader, and the insights and spiritual implications are indeed inspiring even if one must constantly recall the framework within which he works (e.g., "The only weapon of the Church is love"). There is evidence that the author is far more indebted to the "liberal" scholars than his frame of reference would suggest. The pedestrian reviewer has cause to deplore the lack of a subject-index, and the layman who turns to his Webster may flounder at the word "exegesists" for "exegetes."

The Rollins book is a fruitful collaboration of husband and wife, both experienced teachers on the college and postgraduate level. A liberal, middle-of-the-road presentation of the life and ministry of Jesus, the book is an excellent and challenging study in the light of present-day scholarship. Perhaps the writers more explicitly avow the relevance of "the experience of Christian discipleship" to the task of historical criticism than do the other three. "It is a grave error to suppose that complete detachment and lack of emotional concern contribute to the truer understanding of Jesus. Critical

study brings us closer to the outward facts, but the meaning of facts as a whole can be found only by those who have experienced the power of his person" (p. x). The book is intended for a "wide audience," and succeeds in carrying out its intention, although occasional phrases like "*Sitz im Leben*" (p. 46) may not be understood by the general reader.

Taylor's book, the briefest of the four, is a résumé of a lifetime of study by a master in this field. All students of the Gospels, already in his debt, are put under further obligation by this book. It is a scholar's book, although simply and clearly written, for almost every page reveals the scholar's acquaintance with the history and present status of criticism. The modesty and yet firmness of conviction, and the labeling of conjecture as conjecture however strongly argued—these are the hallmarks of true scholarship.

It is not possible within the limits of this paper to do more than sample some significant topics in the four books. Perhaps eschatology should be first because of current critical and theological interest, and a convenient starting point may well be the so-called "little apocalypse" in Mark 13 and the parallels. All four books, as might be anticipated—since three spring from the "liberal" tradition and the other from the Roman Catholic—regard this chapter as presenting difficulties for the interpreter. None of them hews to the line of consistent or futuristic eschatology. Beck appears to accept the traditional liberal view that "a written Jewish document has been adapted by a Christian editor" although he goes on to say, "together with sayings of Jesus, or possibly the adaptation was made by Jesus himself" (p. 290). He notes that "it is important to remember that in Jesus' teaching the coming of the Kingdom of God is not identical with the coming of the Son of Man" (p. 293). Elsewhere he remarks that Jesus' teaching "had power because he believed the Kingdom was near and in some sense realized in himself and in his work. It is near, it is here, and it is to be completed in God's time." (p. 135.)

Taylor writes, "Today there is a growing tendency to recognize in this chapter genuine sayings of Jesus which are seen through an apocalyptic haze" (p. 176). Yet "it is a rash conclusion to dismiss the eschatological discourse as having nothing to do with his teaching" (p. 176), for he foresaw a period of eschatological woes and did not think merely of political events or human evils but "manifestations of satanic power." Taylor's distinctive contribution to the larger issue of eschatology moves around the question of the coming of the Son of Man. "It is both 'realized' and 'futuristic' eschatology," for "if in the early ministry of Jesus, the Son of Man is

predominantly the community, it is natural to connect with this teaching sayings and parables relating to the Parousia. . . . If, on the other hand, the personal use of the name marks the later ministry, the Parousia must again present itself as integral to the teaching." (p. 179.) This presupposes, of course, some confidence in the historian's ability to trace a development between the early and the later stages of Jesus' ministry. But there need be no abrupt transition, Taylor holds, for "in reality, the Son of Man is never the community alone and he is never only a person. The two conceptions, the communal and the person, coexist, just as the Kingdom is present and future, and precisely as Jesus is the Messiah here and now and *Christus designatus*. Only the atomism of Western thought conceals from us the necessary coexistence of these conceptions. . . . If, then, we are right in thinking that more and more, as his ministry unfolded, Jesus conceived himself to be the Son of Man par excellence, he must needs have thought of his Parousia in glory, and all the more since, as the suffering Son of Man, his suffering is to be subsumed and glorified in victory." (pp. 179, 180.) This will obviously prove satisfactory only to those who share the author's confidence that stages in the ministry can be discerned. The similarity of Taylor's hypothesis to Dr. T. W. Manson's well-known view will be recognized.

The Rollins book accepts the now traditional liberal view of Mark 13. That chapter is confused by the interweaving of several distinct kinds of material, but "there are embedded within it some probable genuine eschatological sayings of Jesus . . . that . . . symbolically conveyed his faith in the triumph of God's Kingdom" (p. 226). The writers relate this eschatological faith to the sayings of Jesus as gathered in the Sermon on the Mount by another although not necessarily contradictory view from Taylor's. They follow the clue of Hans Windisch that two great currents of the Synoptic proclamation of Jesus, a "purified and radicalized wisdom teaching" and a "prophetic-eschatological proclamation of salvation and judgment" flow side by side in the Synoptics. The solution they propose is that the two streams reveal the same motives. "In the 'wisdom' utterances, Jesus sets forth those inward qualities which produce truly fruitful and satisfying living here and now. Yet these very qualities actualize a relation with God which the eschatological demonstration of His nature and purpose can only vindicate and consummate. . . . The 'wisdom' approach and the 'eschatological' approach thus stimulate the same inner attitudes." (p. 80.)

Daniel-Rops has no difficulty here, or elsewhere, in reconciling ap-

parent contradictions or perplexities in the sources. Yet he knows that these difficulties exist, for he writes of Mark 13, "The vision of Israel under the terror of the judgment which obsessed Jesus during these last days [he means the destruction of Jerusalem] merged naturally into the wider vision of that other judgment, when the whole world shall be weighed in the balance. . . . There is no real confusion in the words of Christ but unquestionably the sequence of thought was *moulded less by logic than by that symbolism which is such a profound but obscure part of the human consciousness.*" (p. 455, italics mine.)

The discussions of the mighty works of Jesus in the four books reveal a certain similarity despite important differences. The accent in all four is on the meaning of these miracles for the first century and for us today rather than upon the sheer factuality of the narratives and the rationalization of records in terms of a modern scientific frame of reference. Daniel-Rops, to be sure, dismisses these attempts at rationalization as absurd. Writing of the feeding of the multitude he says, "It is futile to see in this miracle, as certain rationalists have contended, nothing but a lesson on trusting to Providence, the Messiah having simply given the order to distribute the food because he knew that provisions were concealed among the crowd and would be produced at the opportune moment. And it is quite absurd to talk about an 'augmentation of the nutritive power of the five loaves' or of an hypnotic action upon five thousand stomachs. . . . Jesus accomplished simply what, as God, he could accomplish." (p. 255.) Yet, while affirming the material reality of the miracle, he is not content to leave it at that. It is "a prefiguration of the later sacrament (the Eucharist), and its promise" (p. 256).

The other three writers unite in centering attention not upon what Jesus could or could not do, but upon the witness these narratives bear to the "stupendous power and true value of the oncoming kingdom of God . . . not human in origin or devising, but . . . the mighty act of God for the salvation of men."¹ Nevertheless, they do transmit, however tentatively, the familiar rationalizations: the disciples not the lake were addressed, the daughter of Jairus was in a coma, the herd of swine was frightened by the crazy behavior of the demoniac (sheep, maybe, but pigs?), and the like. One wonders what religious interest is served by rationalizations.

It will be of interest to Protestant readers to observe how much freer the Roman Catholic author is in depicting the "humanity" of Jesus.

¹ Beck, D. W., *op. cit.*, p. 208; a quotation from Grant, F. C., *An Introduction to New Testament Thought*, p. 158.

Phrases such as "the nervous, excitable Jew" (p. 204), who "deliberately sought to arouse Jewish resentment" so as not to prolong events (p. 445), who "displayed a sort of peasant cunning" (p. 445), whose "shrewd wit got the better of them" (p. 447) are not usual in Protestant lives of Jesus. They cause no difficulty whatever for Daniel-Rops, being, indeed, the logical outcome of his thesis that, save for a few moments of self-revelation and in the working of his miracles, Jesus was "at all other times . . . a man like other men" (p. 295). While the other writers would no doubt agree that the relation of the divine and the human in Jesus is a mystery, they can hardly rest content with so naïve a portrait, which to the Protestant reader makes Jesus not only a mystery but a monstrosity. Unless one is able to rest back upon Catholic dogma, such a dichotomy would seem to leave our humanity unredeemed. The other authors, each in his own way, seek to present Jesus as an integrated person, manifesting in our humanity the Will of God for our salvation. This, they believe, is what the Gospels are about.

The Literature of the History of Methodism

EDWARD L. FORTNEY

THE TITLE OF THIS ARTICLE suggests a magnitude beyond the limits of available space. I propose as subtitle a definition of the subject: "Some notes toward a bibliography on Methodism." The purpose is to indicate what basic helps can be consulted by a person interested in informing himself about the people called Methodists. I give only a few directions for the finding of one's way through a vast field of literature that lies fallow for the hand of an expert bibliographer.

I

There are relatively few bibliographies on Methodism as a whole. These are now long out of date and out of print. They are immensely serviceable, however, for the coverage of the period to their compilation. I refer to George Osborn, *Outlines of Wesleyan Bibliography; or, a Record of Methodist Literature from the Beginning. In Two Parts: The First Containing the Publications of John and Charles Wesley, Arranged in Order of Time; The Second Those of Methodist Preachers, Alphabetically Arranged* (London, 1869); and J. Alfred Sharp, *A Catalogue of Manuscripts and Relics, Engravings and Photographs, Medals, Books and Pamphlets, Pottery, Medallions, Etc. Belonging to the Wesleyan Methodist Conference, Together with Some of the Principal Books, MSS., Etc., in the Possession of the United Methodist Church* (London, 1921).

The Osborn item needs no annotation, as the title clearly indicates the scope of the contents. Its value lies in the fact that it is the earliest of the bibliographies. The item by Sharp, however, is deserving of some clarification. As the title indicates, this is a catalogue of a private library and not an exhaustive bibliography. But the scope of the work makes it invaluable for the beginner in Methodist literature. It has not a simple alphabetical arrangement but is a series of classified lists. These cover

EDWARD L. FORTNEY, B.D., M.A., is Librarian at Drew University, Madison, New Jersey. This article on Methodist bibliography is the first of a series; it will be followed in future issues by similar articles from authorities in other leading denominations.

such subjects as the publications of John and Charles Wesley, the biographies of the Wesleys, anti-Methodist literature, history and polity of Methodism, eighteenth-century books and pamphlets by Methodists or "of Methodist interest," the internal controversies of Methodism, hymn and tune books (after 1800), magazines and other periodical literature. As can readily be seen, any subsequent bibliography of Methodism must be erected with this one as its base. Osborn contains no entries relating to American Methodism; Sharp has some.

The best single source for American Methodism is the bibliography compiled by William Warren Sweet in his *Religion on the American Frontier 1783-1840, Vol. IV: The Methodists, a Collection of Source Materials* (Chicago, 1946). The bibliography lists the manuscript material by its location and other works under the categories of official documents, periodicals, autobiographies and secondary materials. The lists of official documents and periodicals make convenient check lists of titles. A book edited by F. A. Archibald, *Methodism and Literature: A series of articles from several writers on the literary enterprise and achievements of the Methodist Episcopal Church . . . with a catalogue of select books for the home, the church, and the Sunday-school* (Cincinnati, 1883), as far as I know, is the pioneer attempt at a bibliography in America. Being the collection of a number of contributors, it suffers from the common malady of such projects: uneven quality. The work as a whole is an interesting and informative commentary on the subject indicated by the title, and several chapters are particularly valuable for their bibliographic material.

Some record must be made of the herculean labors of one who was keenly interested in Methodist bibliography. I refer to Samuel G. Ayres, who prepared three manuscript bibliographies. These are a *Supplement* to the work by Osborn; *Works by Methodist Episcopal Authors*; and *Works by Methodist Authors Other than Methodist Episcopal*. The works listed are almost entirely those found in the collections at Drew University and Garrett Biblical Institute. Should some young scholar come along, there is for him the monumental task of compiling a bibliography beyond anything that has yet been done.

Before commencing with specific subject areas within Methodism, I would like to record two bibliographies of materials antagonistic to Methodism. The pioneer work was by Curtis H. Cavender, *Catalogue of works in refutation of Methodism, from its origin in 1729, to the present time. . .* (Philadelphia, 1846). This is a catalogue of only 485 items. However, it lists twenty writings addressed to Wesley after the publication of

A Calm Address to Our American Colonies. An indication that the compiler was still living in an age of acrimonious controversy is the fact that he was an Episcopalian and issued his work under the pseudonym H. C. Decanver. Much more important is the bibliography of Richard Green, *Anti-Methodist publications issued during the eighteenth century; A chronologically arranged and annotated bibliography of all known books and pamphlets written in opposition to the Methodist revival during the life of Wesley; together with an account of replies to them, and of some other publications* (London, 1902). To my knowledge, all that has been done since for the nineteenth century is in a section of Sharp's *Catalogue*.

II

In the area of subject matter it is easy enough to know where to begin. One begins with the Wesleys. Fortunately there is an excellent bibliography of the writings of the two principal founders of Methodism. It is a work by Richard Green, *The Works of John and Charles Wesley. A bibliography: containing an exact account of all the publications issued by the brothers Wesley arranged in chronological order, with a list of the early editions, and descriptive and illustrative notes* (London, 1896). Not all editions of the works of the Wesleys are listed but the noteworthy ones are, with illuminating notes. The standard editions of J. Wesley's principal works (still obtainable) are: *The Journal*, ed. by Nehemiah Curnock, 8 vols.; *The Letters*, ed. by John Telford, 8 vols.; and *The Standard Sermons*, ed. by E. H. Sugden, 2 vols. A serviceable compilation of theological statements made by Wesley has been grouped according to subject by R. W. Burtner and R. E. Chiles, *A Compend of Wesley's Theology* (New York and Nashville, 1954).

I know of no bibliography of works about John Wesley that is readily available. In Archibald's work, *Methodism and Literature*, now out of print, there is a section dealing with biographies of Wesley. The emphasis and annotations are for the earliest "lives." Of very recent date is an unpublished doctoral dissertation at Boston University School of Theology: Herbert Richard Loring, *A Comparison of the Biographies of John Wesley since 1850 in the light of biographical and critical materials* (Th.D., Boston University, 1951). This is a very helpful survey and should be made generally available. These two works taken together offer a minimum list. Since most readers will not have access to the works just cited, I include here some of the noteworthy items about Wesley.

The first distinctive biography was written in 1791, shortly after

Wesley's death. It is John Hampson, *Memoirs of the late Rev. John Wesley, A.M., with a review of his life and writings; and a history of Methodism, from its commencement in 1729 to the present time*, 3 vols. (Sunderland, 1791). This is not an "official" biography, as the author had left the Methodist connection prior to Wesley's death. The "official" biography appeared in 1792. This was the *Life of the Rev. John Wesley, A.M., including an account of the great revival of religion in Europe and America, of which he was the first and chief instrument*, by Dr. Coke and Mr. Moore (London, 1792). This work should have had three authors. Wesley had designated three men as his literary executors. One of them had a disagreement with the Conference and refused to yield what he had written from the data in his possession, apparently intending to capitalize on the copyright in his name. After Coke and Moore published their work, this third of the trio proceeded to write and publish a two-volume work, *Life of Wesley . . .* by John Whitehead (London, 1793). This subsequently went through several British and American editions.

Probably the most controversial of Wesley's biographies is the fourth to appear: Robert Southey, *Life of Wesley*, 2 vols. (London, 1820). Methodists seem inclined to think that Southey as a churchman did not sympathize with Wesley's enthusiastic viewpoint. Two other early biographies have limited worth, but are interesting as part of the picture of the earliest writings. Henry Moore, *Life of John Wesley*, 2 vols. (New York, 1824) had as his purpose the rescuing of the character of Wesley, presumably from Southey and Whitehead. This is followed by Richard Watson, *Life of the Rev. John Wesley*, first American edition (New York, 1831), a work of limited biographical value, but one in which the early doctrinal discussions are set forth by one of Wesley's preachers.

Loring lists thirty-five major biographies written since 1850. Of these I suggest the following for their material: Luke Tyerman, *The Life and Times of the Rev. John Wesley, M.A., founder of the Methodists*, 3 vols., second edition (London, 1872-75), is replete with source quotations, and the record is that of the material prepared in manuscript for publication fully half was excised because of length; termed exhaustive and monumental are the five volumes of John Smith Simon, *John Wesley and the religious societies* (London, 1921), *John Wesley and the Methodist societies* (London, 1923), *John Wesley and the advance of Methodism* (London, 1925), *John Wesley, the master-builder* (London, 1927), and *John Wesley, the last phase* (London, 1934); Francis John McConnell, *John Wesley* (New York, 1939) is engaging and informative as a roving commentary

on the writings concerning Wesley; and a good one-volume introduction is Colwyn Edward Vulliamy, *John Wesley* (London, 1954 reprint [1931]).

The preachers of the early Wesleyan movement have been enshrined by Charles Atmore, *The Methodist Memorial being an impartial sketch of the lives and characters of the preachers who have departed this life since the commencement of the work of God among the people called Methodists* and *An Appendix to the Methodist Memorial: containing a concise history of the introduction of Methodism on the continent of America, and short memoirs of the preachers who have departed this life since that period* (Manchester, 1802). The best single source for biographical information on Methodist ministers is the obituaries in the Conference Minutes. There is an index to these for the American branch in preparation at The Methodist Publishing House Library in Nashville.

To mention some leaders by name is to neglect others, yet those who are familiar to the general reader deserve attention. Most of the contemporary disciples of Wesley have been covered by a biography of some sort. The model biography is said to be by J. W. Etheridge, *Life of Adam Clarke* (London, 1858). The claim has been made that Adam Clarke has done the next-most-to-Wesley for Methodism with his *A Commentary on the Holy Scriptures*, 8 vols. (London, 1810-1825). Biographies for the period of American Methodism to 1900 are numerous. I know of no "standard" biography of any American Methodist. The best source for the leaders is the journals or memoirs which they left behind. The *Journals* of Francis Asbury, 3 vols., were first published in the *Arminian Magazine* in 1789 and subsequently reprinted in revised form in 1854. This work is now undergoing revision and annotation for a new printing. As a biography, that by W. D. Strickland, *The Pioneer Bishop: or the life and times of Francis Asbury* (New York, 1858), is the first and probably the best. The *Journal* of Freeborn Garrettson (Philadelphia, 1791) is badly in need of a scholarly revision. William Warren Sweet has given a workable bibliography of the other "founding fathers" in his work, to which reference has already been made.

The Cyclopaedia of Methodism, embracing sketches of its rise, progress and present condition, with biographical notices and numerous illustrations, ed. by Matthew Simpson, is a fruitful source of succinct biographical material to the date of its printing (4th edition, 1881). A work which is worth a great deal of attention is Frederick DeLand Leete, *Methodist Bishops, Personal notes and bibliography with quotations from unpublished writings and reminiscences* (Nashville, 1948). The work is the fruit of a

life devoted to the garnering of Methodist materials for a reference library. It is, in fact, a preliminary catalogue of data on books by and about Methodist bishops in the United States. This book contains no such information for the Negro churches. The only work I know which partially gives that information is *The Encyclopaedia of the African Methodist Episcopal Church* . . . compiled by Bishop Richard R. Wright, 2d ed. (Philadelphia, 1947). I do not pass by without reference to the volume on Methodists in Wm. B. Sprague's *Annals of the American Pulpit*, the value of the series of which is well known.

III

Historical material considered apart from the biographical is difficult to discuss for want of any adequate bibliography. Not only do I find no complete bibliography, but there is really no adequate historical work available. A work now out of print but immensely serviceable because of its lucidity and indexes is John F. Hurst, *The History of Methodism*, 7 vols. (New York, 1902-04). Three volumes are devoted to British Methodism, three to American Methodism, and one to world-wide Methodism. A popular history is that by Luccock, Hutchinson and Goodloe, *The Story of Methodism* (New York and Nashville, 1949). An even more popular presentation is a picture book by Elmer T. Clark, *An Album of Methodist History* (New York and Nashville, 1952). One third of this latter work is devoted to British Methodism.

All I can do is to indicate some works that illuminate aspects of Methodist history. A useful collection of printed source materials for English Methodism is R. M. Cameron, *The Rise of Methodism: a Source Book* (New York, 1954). The issues of the *Proceedings of the Wesley Historical Society* (England) contain much that is pertinent. This same society sponsors a lecture series devoted to the origins of Methodism. Also it issues at irregular intervals a series known as *Publications*, each item a reprint or first printing of some source material. There is nothing similar to this organization in America, consequently no similar material is available apart from the volume by Sweet, *Religion on the American Frontier*.

A summary history of English Methodism is a trilogy by Maldwyn Edwards, *John Wesley and the eighteenth century* . . . (London, 1933), *After Wesley* (London, 1935), and *Methodism and England . . . 1850-1932* (London, 1943). These cover the two-hundred-year period and contain workable bibliographies. For America, William Warren Sweet, *Methodism in America* (rev. ed. 1954) is the only available work except the older

volume from the American Church History series, James M. Buckley, *A History of Methodists in the United States* (New York, 1903). Neither of these has an adequate bibliography.

For missionary history the monumental work begun, but not yet completed, by W. C. Barclay, on the History of Methodist Missions covers both the history and the missionary activity of the Methodist churches in America. The first two volumes have appeared under the title *Early American Methodism, 1769-1844* (New York, 1949-50). English Methodist missionary activity is popularly summarized in a handy volume by Cyril J. Davey, *The March of Methodism* (London, 1951).

There are fortunately authoritative works available on the ecclesiology of both branches of the church. For the Methodist Church in England (formed in 1932 by the uniting of the Wesleyan Methodist, the Primitive Methodist, and the United Methodist Churches) there is H. Spencer and E. Finch, *The Constitutional Practice and Discipline of the Methodist Church* (London, 1951). For The Methodist Church in America (formed in 1939 by the union of the Methodist Episcopal Church, the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, and the Methodist Protestant Churches) there is Nolan B. Harmon, *The Organization of The Methodist Church* (New York and Nashville, 1948).

The official records of the Methodist churches are embodied in Conference (geographic areas) Minutes, and (sometimes) Journals issued annually. The important statistics from these are printed in what is called *General Minutes of the Annual Conferences*. Every four years a General Conference is held, which issues a *Journal*. There exists also an Ecumenical Methodist Conference, the latest meeting of which was the eighth in 1951. The *Proceedings* of these conferences have been published.

IV

Frequently doctoral dissertations contain valuable bibliographies as well as provide a suitable source of material on specialized aspects of a topic. I append here a selected list compiled from *Doctoral Dissertations Accepted by American Universities* (since 1934), arranged according to a rough subject schedule.

Wesley biographical: Armstrong, Clinton C., *The Religious Leadership of John Wesley* (Thesis, Boston University, 1950); Arnett, William M., *John Wesley—Man of One Book* (Thesis, Drew, 1954); Lee, John D., Jr., *The Conversion Experience of May 24, 1738 in the Life of John Wesley* (Thesis, Boston, 1937); Sweetland, William E., *John Wesley:*

Eighteenth Century (Thesis, Michigan State, 1954); Tsoumas, George J., *A Critical Evaluation of John Wesley's Ordinations from a Greek Orthodox Point of View* (Thesis, Boston, 1953).

Wesley theology: Cannon, William Ragsdale, Jr., *The Doctrine of Justification in the Theology of John Wesley* (Thesis, Yale, 1942); Gray, Wallace G., *The Place of Reason in the Theology of John Wesley* (Thesis, Vanderbilt, 1953); Kapp, John R., *John Wesley's Idea of Authority in the State* (Thesis, Boston, 1938); Lee, Peter A., *The Political Ethics of John Wesley* (Thesis, Yale, 1940); MacArthur, Kathleen W., *The Economic Ethics of John Wesley* (Thesis, Chicago, 1936); McEldowney, James E., *John Wesley's Theology in its Historical Setting* (Thesis, Chicago, 1944); Russell, Bernard C., *The Theory and Practice of Christian Discipline According to John Wesley: its theological bases and its modern relevance* (Thesis, Drew, 1951); Sanders, Paul S., *An Appraisal of John Wesley's Sacramentalism in the Evolution of Early American Methodism* (Thesis, Union Seminary, 1954).

Wesleyan theology: doctrine of perfection: Clark, Robert B., *The History of the Doctrine of Christian Perfection in the Methodist Church Up to 1845* (Thesis, Temple, 1946); Coggin, James E., *John Wesley's Doctrine of Perfection and Influence on Subsequent Theology* (Thesis, Southwestern Baptist, 1950); Manifold, Orrin A., *The Development of John Wesley's Doctrine of Christian Perfection* (Thesis, Boston, 1946); Peters, John L., Jr., *The Development of the Wesleyan Doctrine of Christian Perfection in American Methodism in the Nineteenth Century* (Thesis, Yale, 1950); Thompson, Claude H., *The Witness of American Methodism to the Historical Doctrine of Christian Perfection* (Thesis, Drew, 1949); Turner, George A., *A Comparative Study of the Biblical and Wesleyan Idea of Perfection* (Thesis, Harvard, 1946).

Methodist social teachings: Brown, Forrest R., *The Development of the Social Creed of The Methodist Church* (Thesis, Boston, 1942); Cartwithen, Edward Franklin, *The Attitudes of The Methodist Church Toward Peace and War* (Thesis, Temple, 1945); Kearns, Francis E., *Changing Social Emphases in the Methodist Episcopal Church* (Thesis, Pittsburgh, 1939); Martin, B. Joseph, *History of the Attitudes of The Methodist Church in the United States of America Toward Recreation* (Thesis, Southern California, 1945); Shelton, Arthur E., *The Methodist Church and Industrial Workers in the Southern Coal Fields* (Thesis, Boston, 1950); Williams, Hillman T., *The Methodist Episcopal Church and Industrial Construction, 1908-1939* (Thesis, Temple, 1945).

American Methodist Church: Arends, Robert L., *Early American Methodism and the Church of England* (Thesis, Yale, 1948); Johnson, Charles A., *The Frontier Camp Meeting: Methodist Harvest Time, 1800-1840* (Thesis, Northwestern, 1951); Lawson, Evald B., *The Origin of Swedish Religious Organizations in the United States with Special Reference to Olof Gustaf Hedstrom and the Early Structure of Swedish Methodism* (Thesis, Biblical Seminary, 1937); Roberts, Millard G., *The Methodist Book Concern in the West, 1800-1870* (Thesis, Chicago, 1947); Simpson, Robert D., *Freeborn Garrettson, American Methodist Pioneer* (Thesis, Drew, 1954); Smith, Warren R., *Thomas Coke and Early American Methodism* (Thesis, Boston, 1953); Thacker, Ernest W., *The Methodist Church in Southern California in Relation to the "Social Gospel," 1928 through 1941* (Thesis, Southern California, 1952); Whyman, Henry C., *The Conflict and Adjustment of Two Religious Cultures—The Swedish and the American* (as found in the Swede's relation to American Methodism) (Thesis, New York, 1937); Worley, Harry W., *The Central Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church* (Thesis, Yale, 1938).

Hymnology: McCommon, Paul C., *The Influence of Charles Wesley's Hymns on Baptist Theology* (Thesis, Southern Baptist, 1948); Crawford, Benjamin F., *Changing Conceptions and Motivations of Religion as Revealed in One Hundred Years of Methodist Hymnology, 1836-1935* (Thesis, Pittsburgh, 1937).

Missions: Floyd, Arva C., *The Founding of the Japan Methodist Church* (Thesis, Yale, 1939); Stokes, Charles D., *History of Methodist Missions in Korea, 1885-1930* (Thesis, Yale, 1947); Volkmann, Max Friedrich Bernhard, *A Comparative Survey of American Methodist and Baptist Missionary Activity in Europe* (Thesis, Hartford, 1941); Williams, Thomas L., *The Methodist Mission to the Slaves* (Thesis, Yale, 1943).

This paper is one in a series envisaged and projected by Leo T. Crismon, Librarian of The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, Kentucky, for the use of librarians in the American Theological Library Association. I have indicated only some starting points and some available material on Methodism. There are some conspicuous gaps, particularly in reference to Methodist bodies other than the two major groups to which I have given attention. These Methodist groups need extensive work on their materials before there can be a corpus with which to work.

Book Reviews

European Union and United States Foreign Policy: A Study in Sociological Jurisprudence. By F. S. C. NORTHROP. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1954. ix-230 pp. \$4.75.

Among the notable movements in international affairs in recent years has been the effort on the part of certain Socialist, Christian Democratic, and Liberal party leaders in Western Europe, both Protestant and Roman Catholic, to bring about some form of limited, federative union embracing France, Belgium, the Netherlands, Luxembourg, West Germany, and Italy. Professor Northrop has written a strong case in support of this cause.

The treatment of the subject here is divided into three distinct but interrelated parts. The first five chapters analyze the growth in the postwar period of the movement for European Union and contain a recital of the basic provisions of the instruments establishing the Council of Europe, the European Coal and Steel Community, and the signed but unfulfilled documents relating to the European Defense Community and the projected European Political Community. Chapters Six to Eight contain the most significant contribution of the book. This is an extensive analysis of the attitudes, positions, and relative strength of the political parties in the six Western European countries supporting the idea of forming a Continental European Community with a limited union empowered to exercise certain supranational powers. The third element in Professor Northrop's volume deals with the intimate connection between fluctuations in American foreign policy from 1949 to 1954, and the ups and downs of the European movement.

Running through the entire essay is the theme that this is a case study in sociological jurisprudence aiming to demonstrate the viability of the concept of "living law" as being an essential foundation for the realization of any substantial unity among states and for the growth of lasting positive law. Without disparaging the thesis that strong elements of common ideological and political belief, common concepts of morality and ethics and of political aspiration, together with experiences of association, must exist among a group of states considering the establishment of a political or defense community, it is the opinion of this reviewer that the author weighs down his reader with needless repetition of his "living law" phraseology, to the point that he sometimes confuses the reader on what is existent positive law in the juridical sense and what the author hopes one day may become law in this sense.

At times Professor Northrop gives the impression that instruments designed to create the now defunct European Defense Community and the as-yet nonexistent supranational organs of the projected European Political Community had already become juridically effective when he wrote. Unfortunately, the author's pen was laid down on May 26, 1954, before Europe and America were thrown into a frantic search for another formula by the failure of the French Assembly to confirm adherence to the European Defense Community pacts. There is no doubt that the idea of union is still adhered to in many quarters of the Western European countries. Even M. Mendés-France has expressed his desire to see the countries continue to move in this direction. One may hope, therefore, that Professor Northrop will continue the study which he has begun of this truly epic movement when the passage of time has seen the consummation of further affirmative steps toward union.

The first portion of Professor Northrop's volume deals with the steps taken since 1945 leading to the formation of the Council of Europe, the European Coal and Steel Community, the signing of the treaties for the European Defense Community, the drafting of constitutional documents for a co-related European Political Community, and the Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms. It unfortunately fails to give much of the background history underlying this postwar movement. No reference is made, for example, to the notable albeit ill-starred efforts of Count Coudenhove-Kalergi, of French Premier Aristide Briand, or of Édouard Herriot for a United States of Europe during the interwar years. What has transpired since 1945 may be attributed in part at least to the seed which they planted and cultivated. The ideas which were taking gradual shape then surely assisted in fashioning the "living law" which becomes manifest today.

Professor Northrop's study can be said to be a genuine contribution to knowledge in its second part. Here, on the basis of extensive interviews with Western European leaders, newspapermen, American officials, and others, he has written an exceedingly clear, well-reasoned account of the political elements in each of the Western European countries concerned which can be figured as being for or opposed to Continental Union. Readers of this journal will be interested in particular in his analysis of the positions and relative strength of the Protestant and Catholic forces on this question. His strong belief that a merger of Eastern and Western Germany would result in the ascendancy of a Protestant influence that would not only work against genuine union but pave the way for the revival of militarism and extremism gives cause for serious thought. Professor Northrop indicates it as his belief that Western European political leaders brought up in the Roman Catholic faith, but rejecting clericalism and accepting Stoic and empirical traditions of liberal pluralism, are capable of giving, in conjunction with the present liberal-minded Protestants of the Netherlands and West Germany, guidance toward a larger political unity which will guarantee civil, political, and religious beliefs.

Professor Northrop's closing chapters are filled with a vigorous demonstration of the extent to which American politics and diplomacy from 1952 to 1954 have filled Europeans with dismay and caused them to have grave misgivings both on NATO and on German rearmament. What is needed to produce interallied confidence and unity again? The author believes the President must show that American policy is for peace and that it regards NATO as a defensive and not an aggressive alliance. He believes, and rightly so, that it is time Americans treated foreign policy as being above domestic politics, a bipartisan endeavor. He believes we must conduct our relations with our European allies on a basis of mutual give-and-take. In his opinion the Berlin and Geneva Conferences already revealed that the foreign policy of the Eisenhower administration has been "a tragic failure."

In conclusion, Professor Northrop states it as his belief that "Only by combining the liberalizing effect of its Protestant Reformation and of its modern British Empirical and Continental Rationalistic philosophy with its Roman Catholic religious, and Stoic Roman secular, concept of moral man as universal man, rather than nationalistic tribal man, can Europe substitute for its traditional inclination toward the chauvinistic iron framework of empire a liberally democratic supranational community and achieve the Stoic respect for intimate rights of human nature, which the pluralistic principle of religious and political sovereignty expresses, thereby turning into a positive political reality that impress of unity which is its genius." "Only by objectively understanding, contributing to and profiting from this great experiment" looking toward

the creation of a European union "can the United States find a foreign policy that serves both its own values and the peace of the world." Professor Northrop's little volume is an eloquent testimonial to the devotion being given in Europe to the fashioning of a new era in the relationships of some of its war-torn countries.

NORMAN J. PADEFORD

Professor of International Relations, Massachusetts Institute of Technology,
Cambridge, Massachusetts.

The Sources of Western Morality. By GEORGIA HARKNESS. New York:
Charles Scribner's Sons, 1954. xi-257 pp. \$3.50.

Dr. Georgia Harkness, since 1950 professor at the Pacific School of Religion, Berkeley, California, adds another to her contributions to intelligent communication in the fields of philosophy of religion and Christian ethics. For a relatively brief and helpful study of some of the influences which bear upon western morality, this book is to be commended. Her purpose is to "give a simple, organic presentation of the major historical currents that have shaped our moral ideals and culture" (p. vii). According to her analysis, these historical currents flowed through primitive society, Egypt, the Mesopotamian valley, and Palestine. In the latter country, she traces two strands, the Hebrew and the Christian. Perhaps we should say the Palestinian and Mediterranean cultures rather than Palestine alone for the latter two currents.

The conviction which underlies her justification that the "major currents" were ancient is that in some real sense the culmination of ethical idealism was reached in the life and teachings of Jesus. Coupled with this is the belief that ideals are always traditional and shaped by the past. At the same time, she recognizes the fact that many of our present ideals, if we may call them that, emerged from the scientific and social upheavals of the past four centuries. As she states it, "In the two post-war periods the immorality of a machine-made, profit-dominated society became more virulent, as in the depression years they became more evident" (p. 3). It is against this background, then, that she presents some of the more enduring and presumably more adequate ideals derived from the civilizations reviewed in this book.

She begins with an analysis of the morals of primitive society, relying primarily upon such men as Sir James G. Frazer, Edward A. Westermarck, and L. T. Hobhouse. Four institutions are selected for consideration. They are the family, economic organization, civic relations, and religion. She restates the view that the family is the "key to all social organization," in primitive society. This may be true, but other anthropologists would see this "key" in magic or what I normally call metatechnological phases of life as the determining factor. She finds the basis of many of our contemporary ethico-social values operative here, particularly maternal tenderness, protectiveness, reverence, obedience, and fair play (p. 32). She likewise notes some tendencies toward individualism and the beginnings of justice. She stresses, somewhat, the reinforcement toward morality derived from belief in the unseen world.

In Egyptian civilization she finds belief in immortality dependent upon moral goodness. This would constitute a religious reinforcement of the moral ideal. In the case of the civilizations which developed in the Mesopotamian valley, the Sumerian and later the Semitic cultures proved that a high type of civilization can exist without democracy; and that in a civilization whose religion is more nonmoral than moral the moral life will be uncreative. Also, it is asserted that studies in these several

cultures indicate that the art of war and those of peace cannot be conjoined, and that power finally corrupts itself.

This is perhaps sufficient to indicate the general nature of Dr. Harkness' discussion. There will be those who will find fault with her suggestion that there is such a thing as "primitive society." They will assert, as do many recent anthropologists, that there are differences among primitive groups almost as great as between the other cultures or civilizations she discusses. Primitive peoples have many types of family relationships, economic organizations, civic relationships, and religion, if we can call a mixture of magic, shamanism, and fetishism religion. The primary criticism, or question, concerns the assumption that contemporary ideals are developments of ancient thought-forms and ideals. It presupposes the noncreative character of any given age, which will, of course, preclude the creativity of all ages. If the modern world is uncreative, and obtained its ideals from the past, presumably the past would have to seek the source of its ideals elsewhere. Contemporary ethicists are more inclined to find the source of creativity in the emergence of novel situations. Some ages have more of these, and thus may be more creative. Others are more stable and have less reason for the development of the new in the moral field.

I doubt that her suggestion can maintain itself. What appears to be the case is that our ideals are always outmoded. Each age confronts problems which differ more or less markedly from those of the preceding age. Accordingly, the ideals developed to meet the issues of the past are more or less irrelevant to the solution of present problems. Solutions have to be found for the new problem. Analogies from past ages may offer suggestions; or new solutions may be invented for which the past is asked to provide justification. It is precisely this factor which makes moral progress so slow. Only when physicians freed themselves from dependence upon Hippocrates and Galen, and sought in the actualities of the present, was medical progress made possible. It is worth considering whether or not we are at present in the moral field where medicine was several centuries ago, and whether more rapid progress will be made if we accept for ourselves the responsibility of finding solutions for our present moral problems. I hope, then, that Dr. Harkness' book will be read for its historic interest rather than for its prescriptive possibilities. If mankind has learned nothing morally valuable during the past two thousand years, the situation confronting us is really depressing.

WILLIAM H. BERNHARDT

Professor of Philosophy of Religion and Christian Ethics, the Iliff School of Theology, Denver, Colorado.

Be Not Afraid: A Denunciation of Despair. By EMMANUEL MOUNIER. Translated by Cynthia Rowland. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1954. xxvii-203 pp. \$3.50.

The Way of a Pilgrim and The Pilgrim Continues His Way. Anonymous. Translated by R. M. French. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1954. x-242 pp. \$2.75.

Here are two books published in the same year by the same publisher. Different as their authors and content may be, both books appear to us as spiritual landmarks of absorbing interest in our time. True, one of them was written a hundred years ago in Russia, the other is the social and religious testament of a Frenchman who died in 1947. Yet there is an inner link between the two volumes, which should be placed side by side on our bookshelf.

I

Emmanuel Mounier is best known as the creator of the *Personalist Movement* in France, and the editor of the review, *Esprit*. Published in Paris by a group of young French, Belgian, and German intellectuals, *Esprit* called itself an international periodical. A Catholic himself, Mounier received contributions from non-Catholics; all men of good will took part in the Personalist Movement. Mounier was a man dedicated and committed to one task: to create, as he wrote, "a Christian order amid the present disorder"; to re-Christianize and rehumanize man and society; to raise the dignity of the human person, created in the image and semblance of God, above materialistic, totalitarian, and collectivist ideologies. Such was the essence of the "Personalist revolution." In order to fight his battle, Mounier gave up a brilliant academic career, lived in poverty, worked hard, and shunned no sacrifice. During World War II, he joined the Resistance, was arrested by the Nazis, went on a hunger strike. After the Liberation he resumed his editorial work. His premature death, at the age of forty-five, was due to the privations and sufferings he endured.

During his brief but extraordinarily active span of life, Mounier fought passionately against corruption, the powers of money, injustice, both rightist and leftist tyranny, and every kind of discrimination. Yet, when he met his opponents in the field, he always tried to play fair, to understand them, to realize the cause of their dissensions and of the development of their false doctrines. This is why, as Leslie Paul tells us in his excellent preface to *Be Not Afraid*, Mounier did at times play "a dangerous role," and did seem ambiguous. He himself declared that he was not a politician. "He was," writes Leslie Paul, "too conscious of eternal issues to be a reliable party man . . . it is as the founder and explorer of what has been called *une sociologie des profondeurs* (depth sociology) that he will be remembered."

It is precisely this "depth sociology" which is presented in *Be Not Afraid*. Mounier tells us how and why we must overcome the great Fear of our time—or more correctly speaking, several great fear complexes: the fear of a third world war; the fear of the atom bomb and total destruction; the fear of the machine which heralds purely material achievements, meanwhile disrupting the life of man and society; fear of progress, as long as it is merely mechanistic, fear of social advancement when its aim is collectivist. In other words, this is a sort of revised and more terrifying version of the Apocalypse. Mounier shows us how to dispel these fears by denouncing them as bad dreams. Man, who discovered atomic energy, is not necessarily doomed to be destroyed or to destroy others. Man, who runs and improves machines, is himself not a blind tool, neither is he the slave of his own tools. On the contrary, machines can liberate him from enslavement. As to progress, Mounier writes: "Christianity does not necessarily have to sponsor every hypothesis or philosophy which is produced by modern theories of progress. Between the Christian idea of meaningful history and the idea of indefinite progress, as it is often conceived, there is a difference of ontological structure." And Mounier adds that "meaningful history" is Salvation.

In the second part of his book, Mounier carefully looks over his own *Personalist Manifesto*, written a decade earlier, in which, he says, he "would not wish to change a single line." However, this is not an attitude of presumption, it is an attitude of faith and courage. What he does in *Be Not Afraid* is exactly what he did ten years before: to face evil and the cowardice it breeds, to get down to evil's infested and rotten roots, in order to emerge into God's world. One of the book's most interesting chapters is entitled, "To the Heart of Materialism, Collectivism, and Spirituality."

II

Compared to Mounier's tragic, fearful, and confused modern "apocalypse," *The Way of a Pilgrim* may indeed seem peaceful enough. However, if we look at the date of this unusual piece of writing, we find that it was done in the 1850's, in Russia, at the time of the Crimean War, and under the reign of Tsar Nicholas I. This reign was not exactly a happy one; it was marked by tyranny and ended in defeat. The author of the book is unknown; the story was discovered by a monk of Mount Athos, copied by an abbot of Kazan, and was first published in 1884. But we know that the pilgrim who told the story was a poor peasant; his tale begins with the lines: "By the grace of God I am a Christian man, by my actions a great sinner, and by calling a homeless wanderer of the humblest birth who roams from place to place. My worldly goods are a knapsack with some dried bread . . . and in my breast pocket a Bible. That is all."

This man had spent his youth in his native village, where his grandfather taught him to read, mainly the Bible. He married early, and early lost his wife. Grief-stricken, he sold all his belongings except the Bible, and set out on his pilgrimage. This "wandering in Christ," as the Russians call it, was not uncommon among the Russian people; maybe one of its latest manifestations was Tolstoy's leaving his home in search of truth on the eve of his death and at the age of eighty-two. Though typical of this peculiar roving spirit, the Pilgrim's "Way" was unusual. First of all because of the tremendous distances covered on foot, mostly begging or doing occasional jobs, and wandering all through Russia and Siberia. The pilgrimage was marked by great hardships, trials, and encounters with fellow beings not often friendly nor helpful. In fact, one of them stole the Pilgrim's Bible.

Our wanderer in Christ went on and on, until he found that which he was looking for. A holy man taught him to say the "Prayer of Jesus." This is a brief ejaculation: "Lord Jesus Christ have mercy on me!" It may be repeated many times, indeed it is said over and over again, until it becomes a method of continuous prayer. Known in early Greek and Russian devotional practice as the *hesychast*, it was illustrated in the famous teaching of Saint Nilus of Sorsk. In the Pilgrim's story, this devotion is strikingly demonstrated as a spiritual weapon and as a source of ineffable joy and peace.

No wonder the *Way of the Pilgrim* is a favorite devotional book among Russian priests, monks, and laymen. The Western reader has compared it to *The Imitation of Christ* and to *The Cloud of Unknowing*. In many ways the Pilgrim's story echoes Mounier's unwavering and fearless faith, that man *communes* in Christ.

HÉLÈNE ISWOLSKY

Instructor in Russian Language and Literature, the Russian Institute of Fordham University, New York City; former contributor to Mounier's review, *Esprit*.

Ed. Note: *The Third Hour*, to which Maria F. Sulzbach devotes an article elsewhere in this issue, carried an essay on *The Way of a Pilgrim* by Dorothy Day (Issue VI) and "Death of Mounier" by Rev. J. Daniélou, S.J. (Issue V).

Jeremiah: Chronologically arranged, translated, and interpreted. By ELMER LESLIE. New York: The Abingdon Press, 1954. 349 pp. \$4.75.

The period between the decline and fall of the Assyrian Empire and the Babylonian conquest of Judah in 586 B.C. was one of profound dislocation and upheaval, one of the most tumultuous in human history. Like the times of Abraham

and Moses, they witnessed a vast turbulence of many peoples. Assyrians, Egyptians, Babylonians, Medes, Scythians, and other peoples were engaged in a struggle for power in which the future of Western Asia was at stake. We possess a substantial literary precipitate from the ancient Near East, which reflects the malaise of the times, and the Bible, significantly, contains a number of writings which reveal the response of the covenant people of Israel to the stress and strain of history. Notable among these are Zephaniah, Deuteronomy, Nahum, Habakkuk, parts of I-II Kings, some of the psalms, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel. Of these books, Jeremiah and Ezekiel have a special interest for us, not only because of the size of the books attributed to them, but more especially because of the ways in which they respond to the events of their age, in the one case, the forty years between the death of Ashurbanipal to the fall of Jerusalem, in the other, the more than twenty years after the first deportation in 593 B.C. The amazing rapport of these two prophets with their times is profoundly portrayed in the kinds of persons which their writings reflect and in the oracles, parables, visions, and autobiographical accounts evoked by the contemporaneous events.

We have long needed a new commentary on the Book of Jeremiah in English. There are a number of excellent German commentaries. The English works by A. S. Peake in the New Century Bible series and by John Skinner (*Prophecy and Religion*) are good, but they are now out of date. Professor Leslie has, therefore, undertaken an important task. He is in many ways particularly well equipped for it. He is, for one thing, a careful and conscientious workman. He realizes that all sound interpretation must rest upon responsible handling of the original text. He knows that the prophetic books must be read in the light of their own times, and that literary interpretation is something more than an esthetic exercise. But, above all, he is fitted for this task of reading Jeremiah and of reporting the results of his patient and diligent study by the cast of his mind and his warm religious spirit. His many students and friends will expect from him a deeply reverent treatment of the prophet, and in this they will not be disappointed.

Jeremiah is the most inward of Israel's prophets, and we are fortunate in having from his hand a substantial quantity of authentic material. And we are fortunate, too, that this material is of a varied kind: intensely lyrical effusions where feeling is ranged along the borderline of ecstasy, parables of great simplicity and dramatic power, confessions of incomparable self-revelation. We have, in addition, a prose biography from a writer of almost opposite temperament and mood, as prosaic and literal as Jeremiah is poetic and imaginative.

First of all, Professor Leslie gives us his own translation of the book. On the whole, it is a good rendering, not merely because the meaning of the words is correctly grasped, but also because the Hebrew original is felicitously expressed in its idiomatic English equivalent. Occasionally, however, there are expressions which sound pedantic and awkward, more especially in the poetry. The following examples must suffice: *simultaneously* (6:11), *superficially* (6:14), *as a consequence* (6:18), *give attention to* (!) *the blast of the trumpet* (6:17), *character* (6:27), *but in fact* (8:8), *disgraceful delay* (31:22). Such words may be clear, but they are not Jeremiah's idiom, and in most cases a literal translation of the Hebrew would have been more telling and intelligible.

Leslie does not deal too radically with the text, and his emendations are usually explained in brief notes. His method is to give us small sections of the text, and to precede and follow them with brief comment. Here the discussion is always constructive, and the religious interest paramount. He is indebted throughout to the great German commentaries of Volz and Rudolph, especially the latter. On critical

matters he is generally conservative. He assigns more of the book to Jeremiah than most modern scholars would do. For example, he attributes the whole of Jeremiah 30-31 to the prophet, and places the chapters in the period shortly before the fall of Nineveh in 612 B.C. He is not alone in doing so, to be sure, but it is very hard to believe that the lines so strongly reminiscent of Second Isaiah are really Jeremiah's. On the perplexing question of the Deuteronomic passages, Leslie again adopts a conservative position.

It is, of course, very valuable to have the materials of the book placed in their chronological order. Leslie explains his reasons for the dates he gives to the passages. Not all of these will carry conviction with all scholars, but most of them will commend themselves to many. Even more helpful are the sections of the book which describe the history behind a particular literary unit. Some of these are most illuminating. Leslie senses the fatefulness of Israel's life during these years. He sees them, too, in their spacious perspectives, and he views individual events like the Battle of Carchemish in 604 B.C. against the panorama of world events.

It is possibly too much to ask for a more thorough treatment of the literary problems of the Book of Jeremiah. What is meant here is more than stylistic characterizations or general literary classifications. What we demand in the treatment of any biblical book is the identification of the separate literary units and an explanation for the delimitation. Moreover, today more than ever before, we demand to know the literary type with which we are dealing, the characteristic features of this type, and the functions it performs in communication. Professor Leslie is not only familiar with this kind of study, but has applied it in his teaching and other writing. It is true that we are given occasional aid along this line, but not as much as we require.

Professor Leslie is most at home in religious interpretation. Jeremiah is the most subjective of the prophets, and Leslie is at his best in his discussion of the confessions. But here he is more the modern man viewing Jeremiah in modern psychological categories and evaluations than the ancient Hebrew with his categories. He speaks again and again of Jeremiah's spiritual sensitiveness, his spiritual insight, his heart-searching, etc. But this hardly does justice to the biblical record. Again and again Jeremiah is made to realize that his own best judgments and intuitions and "spiritual" insights are not only not enough, but downright egocentricity. Without this constant conquest of Jeremiah by God, whose word was as a blazing fire and as a hammer which shatters the rocks in pieces, the prophet would not have the stature which Professor Leslie ascribes to him; or, better, the word of the Lord through his servant, Jeremiah, would not address us with such directness and immediacy and overwhelming power. Happily, the book as a whole places the emphasis where it belongs.

This new commentary will have a wide reading. Precisely because Jeremiah spoke so effectively to his own age, he will address us in our own profoundly disturbed and troubled and distraught times—not because of the genius of the prophet, but because he was chosen by God to speak his Word while the world was shaking.

JAMES MUILENBURG

Professor of Hebrew and the Cognate Languages, Union Theological Seminary, New York City.

The Life and Teachings of Jesus. By CHARLES M. LAYMON. New York: The Abingdon Press, 1955. 336 pp. \$3.00.

From the clear map of Palestine next to the title page to the final chapter on Jesus as Lord, this book gives one a sense of solid achievement. The Abingdon Press

has produced an excellent example of high-quality craftsmanship. Dr. Laymon has done what it is frequently said cannot be done—a volume on the Life and Teachings of Jesus. In his preface he admits that a biography in the usual sense of the word is impossible, and then he goes on to offer a very effective substitute for the impossible. In the light of the negative assumptions of some present-day theologians that we can know practically nothing about Jesus, it is with real relief that we can read such a book as this.

The plan of the book is intelligently conceived and competently carried out. In the title it is called a textbook for college courses. It is certainly more readable and interesting than most textbooks.

This reviewer has taught courses in the New Testament for nearly thirty years, though none on the precise title of this book. There are certain particular emphases in which she rejoices. To list a few of these: the familiarity of the author with good solid New Testament scholarship in the fields of literary and historical criticism of the Gospels; willingness to use the results of that scholarship; good brief chapters on background. Students will appreciate Part I. The material is clear and significantly chosen. They will like the questions at the end of each chapter, and the professor ought to appreciate the excellent suggestions for reading. The present reviewer was especially pleased with this feature of the book; so many of her own stand-bys are listed. (It is nice to have others agree with our biases!) Incidentally, the publisher's jacket is an outstandingly honest one.

While Dr. Laymon is very objective in his treatment, for which the class using the book will rise up and bless him, his own preferences do at times shine through. In the still unsettled problem of Jesus' messianic consciousness, he seems to decide that Jesus did believe that he was the Messiah. In the problems arising from form criticism he is on the conservative side, in that he wisely prefers the less radical exponents of the methods to Bultmann and Lightfoot.

There is, however, one point of serious disagreement, which could be due partly to the plan and method of the book's construction. This reviewer is profoundly convinced that the presence of anti-Semitism in the Gospels ought to be recognized by authors more than it is. Among New Testament scholars of distinction, F. C. Grant has done yeoman service on this touchy problem, as has E. C. Colwell in *John Defends the Gospel* (listed and commended by Dr. Laymon). It seems very clear that in this respect the Gospels definitely are consciously biased, even pro-Christian propaganda literature. In the section on Jesus' conflict with the religious leaders, a footnote at least drawing attention to the progressive whitewashing of Pilate, and the casting of full responsibility for the death of Jesus on the Jews, would have been in order. This was practically the only disappointment in the whole book. Is it merely idle speculation to see that Matthew has touched up the portrait of the Pharisees, that Luke's Gentile interests may prevent full objectivity, that the Gospel-making period coincided with a time of Christian-Jewish tension, and that tension is indubitably reflected in these accounts? This is not to deny certain points of real conflict between Jesus and the religious leaders. It is, however, to recognize that the Pharisaic portrait is very much overdone, if the research into Judaism of the first century is as valuable as scholars believe.

But this is a good book, for which we are deeply grateful.

MARY E. ANDREWS

Professor of Religion, Goucher College, Baltimore, Maryland.

Early Christianity: The Purpose of Acts and Other Papers. By BURTON SCOTT EASTON. Edited by FREDERICK C. GRANT. Greenwich, Connecticut: The Seabury Press, 1954. 158 pages. \$3.50.

Burton Scott Easton, who died on March 7, 1950, was one of the most capable and creative and one of the most beloved of American New Testament scholars and teachers. He began his career as a mathematician, having taken his doctor's degree in that field at the University of Pennsylvania. It was while he was an instructor in mathematics at this same university that he decided to prepare for and seek ordination in the Episcopal Church. He completed his work for the B.D. degree at the Philadelphia Divinity School in 1905 and in that same year began his teaching of New Testament at Nashotah House in Wisconsin. He was then twenty-eight years of age. His career since then—at Nashotah House, later at what is now the Seabury-Western Theological Seminary in Evanston, and since 1919 at the General Theological Seminary in New York—has been distinguished not only for inspiring teaching, but also for great scholarly productivity. His books, too numerous to mention in this review, will be consulted by scholars for generations to come. The most notable, perhaps, are his *Commentary on the Gospel of Luke*, his edition of *The Apostolic Tradition* of Hippolytus, and his commentary on the *Pastoral Epistles*. I believe that his commentary on James, to be published in the *Interpreter's Bible*, will also be regarded as one of Dr. Easton's most important works.

The present book, a memorial volume, opens with an impressive biographical essay by Dr. Grant, a longtime and very intimate friend and associate of Dr. Easton. This is followed by several important papers, either out of print or never before published in book form. The most important of these is the monograph, "The Purpose of Acts," originally published in England by S. P. C. K.; but also included are previously unpublished papers, "The Church in the New Testament," "Authority and Liberty in the New Testament," and an abridgment of two articles which originally appeared in the *Anglican Theological Review* on "Jewish and Early Christian Ordination."

The illuminating thesis of the essay, "The Purpose of Acts," is that the author of that work is primarily concerned to represent Christianity as the successor and fulfillment of Judaism and as such entitled to the political immunity which Judaism traditionally enjoyed. In my own judgment Dr. Easton fully established his thesis and therefore made a contribution of permanent value to the study of the always important question of the relation of the early church to the Roman State. The editor and publishers have placed us all in their debt in making available to us this really exciting essay.

No American scholar has thrown as much light as Dr. Easton on the organization and practical functioning of the church in apostolic and post-apostolic times. His works on *The Apostolic Tradition* of Hippolytus and on the *Pastorals* are concerned with these matters and are indispensable to anyone working on problems of the early Christian polity and ministry. The chapter in the present work on Jewish and Christian ordination is important in that same connection.

The book, while scholarly, is not technical. Far from being forbidding to the general reader, it is inviting both in appearance and content.

JOHN KNOX

Director of Studies and Professor of Sacred Literature, Union Theological Seminary, New York City.

Studies in Biblical Theology, Nos. 11-14. Chicago: Alec. R. Allenson, Inc., 1954. Pap., \$1.25 each.

No. 11: **Oral Tradition**. By EDUARD NIELSEN. 108 pp.

No. 12: **The Mission and Achievement of Jesus**. By REGINALD H. FULLER. 128 pp.

No. 13: **Life in Christ**. By THÉO PREISS. 104 pp.

No. 14: **Studies in the Book of Lamentations**. By NORMAN K. GOTZWALD. 122 pp.

Studies in Biblical Theology has become a primary organ of the current rise of biblical theology in the Anglo-Saxon world. This series of monographs stimulates interest for biblical theology both by making available in English translation outstanding landmarks in the flood of biblical theology issuing from the continent, and by providing a means of expression for the rising amount of research in biblical theology by British and American scholars. The year 1954 saw the publication of four studies, which illustrate well the international nature of the series and its balanced emphasis upon Old and New Testament theology.

In *Oral Tradition* the Danish scholar Eduard Nielsen makes accessible to English readers a somewhat revolutionary new movement in Old Testament introduction, a movement called "traditio-historical criticism." This approach to the Old Testament has been developing over a period of twenty years in Scandinavia under the leadership of such scholars as H. S. Nyberg, H. Birkeland, Mowinckel, and Ivan Engnell, but it has been largely unknown outside of Scandinavia. In a Foreword, H. H. Rowley states that Nielsen's book "offers a better introduction to traditio-historical criticism than can be found elsewhere in any of the international languages of scholarship." The basic viewpoint of "traditio-historical criticism" is that "the Old Testament as written literature may in all probability be ascribed to the period between the destruction of Jerusalem in 587 B.C. and the time of the Maccabees." A chapter on "oral tradition in the Near East" is designed to indicate that our modern skepticism as to the trustworthiness of oral tradition "must not be applied as a matter of course to fields with a *milieu* of genuine, living, oral tradition." A further chapter investigates the Old Testament in order to establish the subordinate role of writing in pre-exilic Israel, and to trace the evidence of oral transmission in the Old Testament itself. The book closes with a few examples of "traditio-historical method," in which it is applied to Jeremiah 36, Micah 4-5, and Genesis 6-9. The thesis of this book is too extreme to gain full acceptance, but it will, like "form criticism" in the New Testament, serve as a corrective of and a supplement to the customary literary criticism.

The Mission and Achievement of Jesus, by the British scholar Reginald Fuller, bears as a subtitle: "An examination of the presuppositions of New Testament theology." The author accepts Rudolf Bultmann's classification of Jesus among the presuppositions of the *kerygma* and thus of New Testament theology. "The thesis of this book however is that the presuppositions, as outlined by Dr. Bultmann, are inadequate to account for the *kerygma*, and its purpose is to propose a more adequate interpretation of the history of Jesus to put in its place." Therefore the book does not consist in a debate with Bultmann, but rather in a positive statement of the meaning of Jesus. Between the extremes of Albert Schweitzer's exclusively future, "thoroughgoing" eschatology and C. H. Dodd's exclusively present, "realized" eschatology, Fuller presents the view that for Jesus "the coming Kingdom is proleptically operative," for its "dawning" is present although its "arrival" remains future. Jesus looked upon his

death as a necessity in the plan of God, for the cross was "the decisive event through which God will inaugurate that Reign."

The final section of the book deals with "the raw materials of Christology." The author agrees with Bultmann that the treatment of Jesus should not begin with the question of his "Messianic consciousness," "for Jesus did not come in the first instance to teach a doctrine about his person, but to perform a particular historical task. The decision about his person arises from a decision about him as event, from the decision about what God is performing in him." Jesus did not claim Messianic titles for himself, but such titles accurately designate what he did, and therefore what he was and is. Fuller's book is both a contribution to research into the thought of Jesus, and a readable summary of current research suitable for textbook purposes.

Théo Preiss was a promising young French New Testament scholar, a pupil of Oscar Cullmann and professor at the Protestant seminary at Montpellier, whose career was cut short by his recent death of tuberculosis at the age of thirty-four. A series of his essays published between 1946 and 1950 was collected into a posthumous volume, which here appears in English translation under the title *Life in Christ*. An essay on "justification in Johannine thought" calls attention to the fact that "the formulae suggestive of mystical immanence typical of Johannine language are regularly intermixed with juridical formulae," such as "witness," "witnessing," "judge," "judgment," so that the Johannine viewpoint must be designated "juridical mysticism." An essay on Philemon points out the juridical implications of being "in Christ," for the Pauline attitude toward Philemon and Onesimus is at the same time mystical, based upon the common bond of being "in Christ," and juridical, stated in legal language current in Jewish and Roman law. In an essay on the last judgment of Matthew 25 Preiss shows that the "mystery of the Son of Man," who is present in every man we meet, is accompanied by an "element of juridical substitution." The mystic presence of the Son of Man in mankind brings into human relationships a category of judgment corresponding to the Last Judgment.

An essay on "the vision of history in the New Testament" summarizes the Continental viewpoint familiar to English readers from Oscar Cullmann's *Christ and Time*. The final essay treats the question, "Was the Last Supper a Paschal meal?" Preiss takes the Johannine view that the meal was on the day before the Passover, but nevertheless affirms, "Jesus might well have anticipated that evening not only the feast of the Kingdom in general but also the Paschal motives which this eschatological feast implied for him."

The *Studies in the Book of Lamentations* by Prof. Norman Gottwald of Columbia University are intended to rescue Lamentations from its current fate of being discussed primarily in relation to the introductory questions of authorship, unity, and date. The author has arrived at conclusions on these matters: the five Lamentations were written during the exile "for successive annual days of mourning over the fall of Jerusalem." They stem not from a single author but at least from a harmonious "school of thought," so that it is possible to speak of "the theology of the Book of Lamentations." Indeed the author investigates other introductory problems. The "acrostic form," "an impressive example of spirit controlled by form," is traced back to a purpose which is "basically conceptual and not sensual": "to encourage completeness in the expression of grief, the confession of sin and the instilling of hope." The "literary type" of the individual lamentations is the "communal lament," which however has incorporated elements from the funeral song and the individual lament.

Such introductory studies however are subservient to the main purpose of Prof. Gottwald's book, to demonstrate that "Lamentations is a serious theological document." "The theological significance of Lamentations consists in its bold and forth-right statement of the problem of national disaster: what is the meaning of the terrible historical adversities that have overtaken us between 608 and 586 B.C.?" The Deuteronomic reform under Josiah had proclaimed that Yahweh and his faithful people Israel would be tangibly vindicated in history. With the fall of Jerusalem the whole Israelitic religion hung in the balance. Would the divine guidance of history be rejected and Yahweh be considered a dead divinity, or would the national disaster be interpreted in terms of the Israelitic faith, thus rescuing that faith for post-exilic Judaism and Christianity? It is the voice of Lamentations which first arose after the disaster, and tipped the scales. "The special value of Lamentations for our day is that it offers an illustration of how to survive national calamity without falling into despair on the one side or self-righteousness on the other." Prof. Gottwald succeeds admirably in one of the primary objectives of the current revival of biblical theology: he convinces the reader that something vital is being said in the Bible, and provides the key to finding the relevance of one of its most obscure books.

JAMES M. ROBINSON

Assistant Professor of Biblical Theology, Candler School of Theology, Emory University, Georgia.

The Reformation in England. By PHILIP HUGHES. Volumes II and III. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1954. xv-356, xxx-458 pp. Each \$7.50.

This thorough and scholarly three-volume work was prepared by an eminent Roman Catholic Church historian. Dr. Hughes had already made a reputation for his very competent survey of the *History of the Christian Church*, the story of which he carried down through the career of Martin Luther. He has not as yet told the story of the Christian faith in the modern world. It seems that his key interest has been in the Protestant Reformation. However, this interest is that of a Roman Catholic critic, not of an appreciative participant in the movement he has so competently described. One who reads Hughes thinks of Plato's definition of a philosopher, "the spectator of all time and all existence." Philip Hughes, a good scholastic, would not understand what existentialism is all about.

The second volume is, in my judgment, remarkably superior to the first, which I reviewed in the Spring, 1952, issue of *RELIGION IN LIFE*. The second is more interpretative; however, there are facts aplenty. According to my theory of history, which is that the writer should recreate the past in the present so that the reader thinks he is meeting flesh-and-blood persons and living in a real situation, this book does not qualify. Yet, if one looks at history merely as the arrangement of movements and their consequences in logical sequence, then this book is adequate and can, therefore, be readily used as a text in Roman Catholic schools. To be sure, it is less derogatory and critical of the men and events it describes than Gresar is of Luther. Still, one does not have to read more than the first chapter to realize that the author is an ardent Roman Catholic who looks back on pre-Reformation times in England and the revival of Catholicism under Mary Tudor with a nostalgia that totally incapacitates him for appreciating and properly evaluating the Elizabethan era.

Chapter 2, "The Changing Belief," is admirably done. I would rank that section the best part of the book. But, likewise, the chapter entitled "The Fate of

the Heretics" is not to be glanced over in a cursory way. Mary's fanaticism is not too much different, in reality, from Elizabeth's tolerance, and the book appropriately closes with a chapter, "Dissension in Both Camps."

The third volume, entitled *True Religion Now Established*, is, in my humble judgment, the best of the three. It begins with a description of Queen Elizabeth and of her accession to the English throne. Not only does this first chapter describe the enigma of the queen's character and the contradictory elements in her religious belief, but at the same time it gives a competent survey of the social, economic, and political problems which the England of her day faced. Really Elizabeth was bent on solving those problems. Religion was just one of the means she had at her disposal for governing her people in a manner which she felt was for their best interests and the welfare of their nation.

The second chapter, "The Decision of 1559," attempts to describe the bent of Elizabeth's reign as that reign affected the Reformation. Politics are observed as they intrude upon the domain of religion, and the convocation is described as it protests against the absolute Erastianism which was to mark the queen's reign. The uniformity bill, passed April 29, is set forth, with all of the provisions in it for the Act of Supremacy, with the subsidiary definition of heresy and the removal of decisions in this regard from the clergy to the state. Philip Hughes confesses, most disappointingly, that no open resistance from the clergy was encountered as these innovations were established.

Chapters 4 and 5 describe the course of events within the church after the settlement was effected. The readers will find these chapters of unusual interest and value, especially the descriptions they afford of Cartwright, Archbishop Whitgift, and especially Richard Hooker, whose mind established the theology of the English Church.

Chapter 1 of Part II turns the concern from the actual description of what took place to an analysis of the movement in England. It is interesting to note that Hughes begins this second part with a chapter entitled "Drift." This, of course, indicates his own personal feeling toward the Reformation. He frankly states that the practice of a Catholic life was made impossible by the liberal regime of Elizabeth and that the pressure of her penal laws really hurt the Catholics from the start. She was bent on making everyone a loyal Englishman before anything else. If they showed any interest in religion, that interest had to be made subservient to their patriotism.

Chapter 2 in this second section deals with the leadership of the new movement in England, while Chapter 3 describes the conflict that was produced between the old order and the new.

The critical observer of history will be especially interested in the "Conclusion." Naturally he would expect in that section a carefully worked out analysis of all that has been described. He is bound to be disappointed, for what the author does is to show that the policies inaugurated by Elizabeth were continued by Mary Stuart's son, faithful to his mother's worst enemy and unfaithful to the heritage Mary, Queen of Scots had bequeathed to him.

The scholar will, of course, want to read these volumes. They will prove dry and difficult reading for the ordinary preacher. Hughes does not exemplify the gifts of a Macaulay or a Gibbon in this particular work. However, I commend these

books as the best treatment of the Protestant Reformation in English by a Roman Catholic.

WILLIAM R. CANNON

Dean and Professor of Church History and Historical Theology, the School of Theology, Emory University, Georgia.

The Prophetic Faith of Our Fathers. Vol. IV, New World Recovery and Consummation of Prophetic Interpretation. By LEROY EDWIN FROOM. Washington, D. C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association, 1954. 1,295 pp. \$8.50.

With this volume, Professor Froom has brought to completion a task that has engaged him for twenty years—the preparation of a detailed history of the “prophetic” interpretation of Scripture from the days of the early church to the time of consummation in the nineteenth century. While the completed work, in its effort to validate a particular denominational point of view, has many of the characteristics of the typical denominational history, it is distinguished by a massiveness of historical research that is astonishing and impressive.

The present volume deals with the American scene and is primarily concerned with the Millerite movement of the 1830's and 1840's, and with the successor Seventh-day Adventist movement under the leadership of Ellen Gould White. William Miller, it may be recalled, had worked out a calculation, based primarily on the eighth and twelfth chapters of the Book of Daniel, which seemed to indicate that the return of Christ to establish his kingdom would occur in 1843, or, according to Jewish reckoning, sometime between March 21, 1843, and March 21, 1844. Further study of the Jewish calendar advanced the date of the expected return to April 18, 1844, and a final calculation suggested that the end of the present age would occur on October 22, 1844. Large numbers of earnest Christians had been caught up in the excitement of the Millerite expectation, and the “chill gray dawn of October 23” symbolized for them “the grayness and bleakness” of the successive disappointments.

For many this was the end of the road, but there were some who refused to surrender their faith. One particular group, which was ultimately to coalesce around the leadership of Ellen Gould White, insisted that the disappointment was the result of a misinterpretation of what had actually taken place on October 22. It was the heavenly sanctuary that had been cleansed on that date, and before the last judgment and Christ's appearance on earth as King of kings the preparation of a cleansed people to receive him was required. One of the marks of this “remnant” was the keeping of the Commandments, which included the keeping of the seventh day as the Sabbath. Thus the observance of the Sabbath was the “seal” of the 144,000 who were to be found faithful in the last days. A further sign was the restoration of the “prophetic gift” in the person of Ellen Gould White. Thus the “disappointments” could be viewed as a sifting time in the total plan of God.

It is well to have this dramatic story retold by a sympathetic interpreter, for it is a story that easily lends itself to exaggeration and has been distorted by many popular “fables.” It is disappointing, however, that the focus of the narrative is narrowed in the period after the Albany Conference of 1845, so that successor-movements other than that represented by the Seventh-day Adventist Church are excluded from consideration.

Any historical work can be questioned and criticized by those who do not accept the presuppositions of the author, and this study is no exception. To many, there will seem to be a reading back into the past of a contemporary point of view, and not everyone will find the fulfillment of Ellen Gould White's prophecies wholly convincing. But within the framework of the author's own assumptions, *The Prophetic Faith of Our Fathers* represents a careful, detailed, and painstaking compilation of interesting and important historical material. One incidental regret is that the author did not explore the possibility that the calculations of William Miller may have been influenced by the strikingly similar calculations of members of the Continental Society in Great Britain. To the uninitiated, it may be explained that the calculations were based on the assumption that one "day" in biblical prophecy represents one year (Numbers 14:34, and Ezekiel 4:6), and that a "time" represents a year of days. Thus the "seven times" that Israel shall be punished represents 84 months (7×12) or 2,520 days (12×30) or, in terms of our chronology, 2,520 years.

WINTHROP S. HUDSON

Professor of The History of Christianity, Colgate Rochester Divinity School, Rochester, New York.

The Social Self. By PAUL E. PFUETZE. New York: Bookman Associates, 1954. vii-392 pp. \$4.50.

Both the social behaviorist, George Herbert Mead, and the Jewish existentialist, Martin Buber, hold that man's self comes into being in relation with other selves rather than independently of and prior to that relation. Starting with the remarkable similarities between the thought of Mead and Buber, Professor Pfuetze concludes that "the social doctrine of the self can be developed and elaborated empirically, independently of disparate methodologies and metaphysical viewpoints." Actually, in the body of the book, he shows just the contrary, namely, that the similarities between Mead's and Buber's thought are not so significant as the differences in method, spirit, and metaphysical assumptions.

Professor Pfuetze makes several very telling criticisms of Mead's thought: As a biologically-based behaviorist Mead has attempted the impossible feat of deriving a free and responsible agent from a socially conditioned organism; for all his concern for individual integrity, he tends in the end to sacrifice the individual to the social and to lose sight of the real uniqueness and value of the self; he is guilty of an undue optimism which makes him identify historical change with progress; he fails to see the inadequacies of a purely scientific and technical attitude toward human nature and moral change. Mead has assumed an identity of the social and the moral order which ignores moral sin in the individual and the tragic contradictions in society.

Pfuetze's presentation of Buber's thought includes many excellent insights into Buber's dialogical, or "I-Thou," philosophy. But along with these insights there are numerous partial understandings and mistaken interpretations. He has, for example, identified the "I" of Buber's I-Thou relation with the Kantian transcendental subject. Actually, Kant's subject is the rational part of man only, Buber's the whole person. And he has attempted to subsume Buber under the process metaphysics of Whitehead and Hartshorne, from whom Buber differs both in his understanding of God and of the relation of God to man and the world. He has frequently treated Buber's distinction between "I-Thou" and "I-It" as a distinction

between the *objects* of relationship—persons and things—rather than as a distinction between two types of relationship, the reciprocal and the subject-object.

Although *The Social Self* is centrally concerned with philosophical anthropology, the problem of what man is, Pfuetze has made no use whatsoever of "Distance and Relation," Buber's most mature and explicit statement of his anthropology, despite the fact that this essay is listed in his bibliography. Again, he criticizes Buber's attitude toward evil as unduly optimistic and unrealistic, yet nowhere takes account of the second, radical stage of evil as absolute self-affirmation that Buber describes in *Good and Evil*, or of Buber's concrete anthropological description of the first stage of evil as indecision. He repeatedly criticizes Buber's thought as "vague" and inconsistent, yet he does not present any specific material to explain these criticisms.

The meeting with the "Eternal Thou" is, for Buber, precisely the most concrete of man's experiences. Yet Pfuetze frequently falls into the tendency to equate Buber's "Eternal Thou" with a "metaphysical Thou," the "most general other," or Mead's "generalized other," thus converting God into a universal and objective Being much closer to the Greek than to the Hebrew conception. In addition, he constantly vacillates between reproving Buber for not having a systematic metaphysics and recognizing that such a metaphysics would be inconsistent with Buber's belief that the God who can be put in logical categories is not the real God, whom man knows only in dialogue and not as he is in himself.

While Pfuetze is on solid ground in much of his comparison between Mead and Buber, the value of this comparison is seriously limited by his failure to make an adequate distinction between the social and interpersonal in general and the I-Thou relation in particular. The I-It relation is "social" as well as the I-Thou: many interpersonal relations are really characterized by one's treating the other person as an object to be known and used rather than as someone of value in himself. Buber's distinction between indirect social relations of an I-It nature and direct and reciprocal relations between man and man is so central to his philosophy that it calls in question the ultimate wisdom of coupling Mead and Buber under the phrase "the social self." Pfuetze speaks of Mead's thought as "dialogical," the term which Buber uses to describe the I-Thou relation; yet Mead's "generalized other," his idea of becoming an object to oneself, his conception of communication as primarily objective and universal, his identification of the spontaneous "I" with subjective feeling and of the socialized "me" with rationalized objectivity—all fall within the sphere of I-It and miss Buber's sphere of the "between"!

The essential conclusion of Pfuetze's contrast between Mead and Buber is that although man becomes truly human in relationship, relationship cannot be limited to man but must be at the same time a relation to God. "If man is not made in the image of God, he has to be made in the image of society. He becomes a function of society, the instrument of impersonal ends. In the end he ceases to be man."

MAURICE S. FRIEDMAN

Professor of Philosophy and Literature, Sarah Lawrence College, Bronxville, N. Y.

Theology and Reality. By W. NORMAN PITTINGER. Greenwich: The Seabury Press, 1955. ix-235 pp. \$3.25.

This new study by W. Norman Pittenger is a work in Christian apologetics. It represents a concern to bring the basic theological issues of the Christian faith to the consideration of the great body of thoughtful Christians who lack both the time and the

specialized skills for plunging into the technical areas of historical and contemporary theological studies. The author discusses what he considers to be the main issues relating to the Christian message, and the place of this message in the contemporary world. In doing this he brings to bear much of the best fruits of modern scholarship. This means that the book is not a "popularization" of the Christian Faith, but it also means that it is a work that will be stimulating and instructive to the reflective and inquiring mind of our time.

Professor Pittenger writes from a distinctively Anglican perspective, and this involves considerably more than the fact that he devotes a few chapters to specific items of Anglican faith and practice. Anglicanism has traditionally been characterized as a bridge between Rome and Geneva (or Wittenberg), eschewing what it has deemed to be an overstatement of a fundamental truth on the part of either Roman Catholicism or Continental Protestantism. One of the most critical areas where this spirit has been manifested has had to do with the relation of faith and reason. Accepting the Protestant principle that faith is primarily to be understood as personal encounter with God in Jesus Christ, and therefore not fundamentally a matter of "assent" to propositional and doctrinal truths, it has at the same time been characteristic of Anglicanism to emphasize the positive powers of reason in all areas of man's experience of the created world. To be sure, reason is never more than fallible because it has been subject to the Fall. Nevertheless, it has great potentialities in probing the mysteries of the created world, and, indeed, serves as a worthy (if not *always* "trustworthy") adjunct to the Faith itself.

This fundamental perspective informs Professor Pittenger's thesis throughout *Theology and Reality*. Its implications are immediately suggested by the very mention of a number of his topical treatments, e.g., "The Christian Faith and Contemporary Science and Philosophy," "Christianity as a Culture," "The Secular and the Religious." The premise that underlies each of these discussions is to be found in Chapter Six, "The Incarnation of the Word of God." Here is stressed, in characteristic Anglican fashion, the view that the Incarnation does not make sound theological sense apart from the Christian doctrine of creation, as such. The "Word made flesh" is central, unique, and decisive, but this does not mean that the Logos of God can be recognized and known only in its historical manifestation in Jesus Christ. In a basic sense the "incarnation" is ingredient to the whole process of creation, in nature, and in man and man's history. Thus, in varying degrees God reveals himself to man in all the orders of creation. Again, the Incarnation itself is deemed theologically meaningful only within this broader context. "Only if every experience of goodness, truth, and beauty, all deep intimations of Deity and all walking with Him, represent actual revelations and 'entrances' of God into our life and into human history, can the doctrine of the Incarnation be firmly based" (p. 102).

From this position an essential autonomy for the various intellectual disciplines is argued. Philosophy, the arts, the sciences, physical and social, do not and cannot have answers on ultimate questions, but they are entitled to an autonomy of method and structure peculiar to their own demands. The theological enterprise is required to go beyond and serve to the "completion" of secular pursuits of truth, but it does so with full cognizance of the best expressions of the total rational and creative outreach of man. Such a theological perspective, though not startling, is of no little interest in our day when the whole question of the relation of faith and reason is in such sharp focus.

One of the most stimulating discussions of the entire book is the chapter on "The

Finality of Christianity." This is an old favorite about which much has been written, much that might better have been left unwritten. Professor Pittenger brings a vigor and freshness to the subject that makes for good and instructive reading.

The book is dedicated to the memory of Paul Elmer More, and the last chapter is devoted to a critical but deeply appreciative appraisal of some of the doctrinal perspectives of this learned and noteworthy scholar who after a long pilgrimage found his way to a dynamic Christian faith.

This book is valuable because it is bound to stimulate its readers to new insights and new perspectives about the relation of thought and faith in Christian experience. It does not solicit agreement for agreement's sake, nor is it likely to receive it on a broad scale in many quarters of contemporary Christian thinking. What it does do is to set forth some of the critical issues in contemporary Christian thought and practice, and to bring to these issues the penetrating reflections of an able representative of one of the great Christian traditions.

HERNDON WAGERS

Professor of Philosophy of Religion, Southern Methodist University, Dallas, Texas.

The Renewal of Man. A 20th-Century Essay on Justification by Faith.

By ALEXANDER MILLER. *Christian Faith Series*, Reinhold Niebuhr, Consulting Editor. New York: Doubleday & Company, 1955. 184 pp. \$2.95.

This book is worthy of the imprimatur of Reinhold Niebuhr, which it bears, and merits that of Martin Luther, which it does not. The first in a series of five in a *Christian Faith Series* on various facets of the faith, to be produced under Dr. Niebuhr's editorial supervision, it purports to commend the doctrine of justification by faith to the twentieth-century mind and to show that this doctrine "touches every aspect of man's life, and touches nothing that it does not illumine." Consequently the author undertakes to relate this doctrine to such matters as contemporary man's dilemma, religion in general, Christian ethics, the life of the mind, vocation, the church, and various more specific concerns in these general categories.

It is a courageous undertaking to tackle this doctrine, as Alexander Miller of Stanford University, the book's author, willingly acknowledges. Especially so, in view of the fact that this series is designed for laymen and strives to avoid what Dr. Niebuhr calls "the frequently esoteric language of which theologians . . . avail themselves." While, for its weighty theme, this book may not achieve wide circulation among the laymen of our churches, Professor Miller has, nevertheless, rendered a great service in presenting this doctrine in an extraordinarily lucid and compelling way.

Through a remarkably perceptive use of contemporary literature and particularly through Arthur Koestler's *The Yogi and the Commissar*, the author points up the bankruptcy of modern man's philosophical options: ". . . either the rejection of the world of nature and history with its intolerable ugliness and its unbearable antimonies, or the deification of nature and history, with the acceptance of its humanly intolerable logic." Professor Miller holds, however, that our main problem arises not so much out of the fact that the alternatives to Christianity have become "flabby and uninviting," but that in the face of this circumstance we do not really know what Christianity is. Christianity is then defined in terms of the Niebuhrian neo-orthodoxy; but Professor Miller is a most convincing disciple and apologist for this school, even to one such as this reviewer, who is not entirely ready to concede that the constructions of neo-orthodoxy are free from the dictates of expediency.

Dr. Niebuhr finds it necessary in his introduction to explain that this book is not an effort at iconoclasm in religion. This word is especially appropriate in that the author attacks head-on some of the most cherished presuppositions of American Protestantism. ". . . the Hebrew-Christian Scriptures are singularly barren of general truths and of ethical principles," he tells us. Nor is the biblical faith the "ethical monotheism" with which modern liberalism wants to equate it." Professor Miller's indictment of the contemporary church's ignorance of the true gospel is as incisive as it is sweeping, but it is occasionally extravagant, as, for example, when he asserts that "the most urgent single reform which contemporary Protestantism needs is the requirement that in public worship the Bible be read as it is written."

Granted the so-called "liberal" churches have not presented the doctrine of justification by faith as tidily as the neo-orthodox might wish; but the neo-orthodox err in their own presupposition that the churches have very largely substituted salvation by works and "the power of positive thinking" for this doctrine. In this reviewer's opinion, at least, "justification by faith" has a firmer hold on the hearts of American laymen and clergy than churchmen confined to the academic atmosphere currently allow.

Professor Miller is at his best in his description of the grounds of the Christian *ethos*. This, he maintains, springs not from specific teachings, but from the disciplines, the character, the family lore and life of the *koinonia*; the Community of Faith, the Company of Justified Men.

"To be a Christian . . . is to be a member of the Community of Faith, the Company of Justified Men," the author concludes. "To be a Christian is to belong here: or rather, since this is in fact where all men belong, it is to belong here and to know that we belong here, in the new humanity which is the fruit of Christ's death. For here it is that life's sweet joys are sanctified, life's precarious decisions garrisoned by the divine wisdom, and life's tragic ambiguities *neither avoided nor resolved*, but comprehended by a divine forgiveness which is sufficient for our necessities, and strong in the measure in which we are content to be vulnerable . . . It is here that we learn, not only that the death of self is the beginning of selfhood and the meaning of our salvation, but by what merciful mechanisms of grace the self is struck down." (Italics my own.)

On the whole, Professor Miller's *apologia* is beautifully knit and difficult to assail. It will present a considerable challenge to those who entertain prejudices against neo-orthodoxy. And it is a dangerous book. I do not think it extravagant to say that some who read it will come perilously close to falling "into the hands of the living God."

WILLIAM COOLIDGE HART

First Church of Christ in Pittsfield, Congregational, Pittsfield, Massachusetts.

A Tale of Two Brothers. By MABEL RICHMOND BRAILSFORD. New York: Oxford University Press, 1945. 301 pp. \$4.00.

Mrs. Brailsford has had the happy idea of telling the story of the relations of John and Charles Wesley. In doing this she naturally covers a good deal of the history of Methodism in the eighteenth century, as well as the personal lives of the two brothers. Her interest, however, is not in Methodism. She tells much that is interesting and a great deal that is half forgotten concerning Charles Wesley and his home life; and she goes into John's unfortunate love affairs, which includes his

marriage, in some detail. The whole is well written and there are new insights into the relations of the two brothers.

According to the author, Samuel Wesley, Jr. stood in a parental relationship to Charles during the latter's school days. Afterward John took Samuel's place, and the words of a later Moravian leader are quoted with approval as expressing Charles' attitude, at least in his earlier manhood. Charles, said the Moravian, "has been attached to him [John] in a manner that made him unsteady in all his connections with other persons, being his implicit follower in all things."

This attachment was broken when Charles interfered with his brother's proposed marriage to Grace Murray. When Charles ceased to travel after his own marriage and later rebelled against John at the time of the latter's ordinations, the ties between the two were severed. Yet the author thinks that, although Charles had failed his brother in public loyalty, "in private the loyalty of his heart had never wavered."

Many readers will think Charles a stronger character than he appears in these pages. True, he had little taste for administration and he was frequently impetuous in word and action. But even Mrs. Brailsford once contrasts Charles' "skepticism" toward people with John's credulity. The fact that Charles was both a Wesley and a poet may explain much that otherwise would be attributed to weakness of character.

There are other places where one cannot always follow Mrs. Brailsford's interpretation. When John Wesley, after his "conversion," is alternating between confidence and doubt, Mrs. Brailsford sees his trouble as in large part due to the disturbing remembrance of his Georgia love affair. "Sophy's wistful and adoring face would swim between him and the pages of Luther's *Commentaries*. . . ." In his agony he went to see his mother, and left her "full of hope and confidence."

This is reading between the lines rather freely. There is nothing in the record to indicate that John was mooning over his lost Sophy, who, the last Wesley heard of her (so far as the Journal shows), was appearing against him before the Grand Jury in Georgia. Nor is there anything in the record to show that Wesley was at that time reading Luther's *Commentaries*.

So far as his trip to see his mother is concerned, Mrs. Brailsford's explanation fits into her theory that John was dependent upon his mother for spiritual advice and comfort throughout her life in much the manner that Charles was supposed to be dependent upon John. Actually, Wesley says in his Journal that he went to tell his mother good-by before he departed to visit the Moravians in Germany. It is evident from a later entry that he read his mother an account of his spiritual pilgrimage and that she approved. It is also evident that she probably did not understand exactly what he was getting at, since she was greatly disturbed later when Samuel, Jr. gave her his explanation of the same paper.

If the only objections to Mrs. Brailsford's book were matters of this kind, they would be insignificant. The pleasure of reading her work and the often neglected aspects of the lives of the two brothers which she illuminates would make such blemishes immaterial. However, the author has chosen to make certain generalizations concerning the effect of Methodism on the social and economic history of Great Britain which, if true, are of great importance.

She repeats the old charge that Wesley's work was palliative and not constructive. All that he did, says Mrs. Brailsford, was to make "intolerable conditions less impossible to bear." When in the nineteenth century, she continues, "the Industrial Revolution

broke upon England, it was only possible in all its human barbarity because of the patience and gentleness of the working man and the pious self-satisfaction of his employer. And for these the Methodist Revival must in part be held responsible."

This is an opinion that has been expressed by competent historians, although others, equally competent, have denied it. If an author shows evidence of familiarity with the history of the eighteenth century and with the opinions of the various scholars who have worked on the social and economic history of the Industrial Revolution, then that author's opinion should be received with respect. Unfortunately, Mrs. Brailsford does not reveal her knowledge—or lack of knowledge—of social and economic matters; but she does show something of the extent of her acquaintance with eighteenth-century religious and political history.

For example, she repeatedly speaks of Nonjurors when she obviously means Nonconformists or Dissenters. Of all people, the fathers of Samuel Wesley and his wife Susanna were not Nonjurors. In telling the story of Susanna's refusal to pray for King William, Mrs. Brailsford says that Susanna's opinion was of "the detestable Tory type." This would have been news to the indignant husband whom Alexander Pope referred to affectionately as "an old Tory."

As to Methodist history, Mrs. Brailsford says that, in answer to appeals from America, John Wesley replied "by ordaining two of his most able and trusted English preachers, one of whom, Francis Asbury, had been in charge of Methodist affairs in America throughout the war years, to be joint Superintendents, and entrusted them with the power to ordain others." Even the most elementary history of Methodism would not have placed Francis Asbury in Bristol to be ordained Superintendent by John Wesley.

In short, *A Tale of Two Brothers*, is well written and well worth reading if taken as a book concerned with the personal lives and relations of John and Charles Wesley, and read with reasonable care. Historical generalizations in the book—and they are few—should be received with caution.

UMPHREY LEE

Chancellor, Southern Methodist University, Dallas, Texas.

Nature and Grace: Selections from the Summa Theologica of Thomas Aquinas. Translated and edited by A. M. FAIRWEATHER. (*The Library of Christian Classics*, Vol. XI.) Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1954. 386 pp. \$5.00.

In order to make a major contribution to Thomistic studies, an edition of selections from the *Summa theologiae* would need to be a masterpiece. It would be too much to say that this volume is that good. Nevertheless, its real virtues will justify its place in the series of twenty-six volumes (ranging from the Apostolic Fathers through the Reformation) to which it belongs, and will make it a useful addition to the books already available to the intelligent reader who wants to increase his knowledge of one of the greatest of Christian teachers.

The volume's most obvious virtue is its theme. Most anthologies emphasize the philosophical side of Aquinas' work—a tendency which makes them helpful to students of philosophy but rather misleading as far as a balanced interpretation of St. Thomas, himself primarily a theologian, is concerned. This volume, however, is definitely theological in its interest. Moreover, the editor has given all his space to material with some bearing on a single theme, of central importance for our apprehension of

the shape of the Thomist synthesis. He has illustrated this topic (indicated by his title) with blocks of "questions" (thirty in all) drawn from the First Part and from both divisions of the Second Part of the *Summa*. One might wish that he had filled out this volume, which is a few pages shorter than many of its companions, with a little more material from the *Prima Secundae*, such as the treatment of the end of man (QQ.1-5), of the nature of virtue (QQ.55ff.), and of natural law (QQ.93-94), since this would have added to the coherence of the selection; but even as it stands the volume will give the careful reader a fair taste of Aquinas' views on a theme of fundamental importance.

The translations are lively and readable, without the sacrifice of accuracy (at least, as far as a spot check showed). Some technicalities might have been rendered differently, but no translation can hope to deal satisfactorily with such terms without the aid of full notes. By and large, this version is as technically adequate as the Dominican translation of the *Summa* and other works, and is more interesting.

The "General Introduction" contains much helpful material. The good formulation of the Thomist attitude toward the creaturely, in contrast to radical "Augustinianism," should be noted (p. 21), as well as the recognition that this is not incompatible with the primacy of grace (pp. 30f.). There are good comments as well on St. Thomas' treatment of providence and original sin (pp. 28-30).

The volume contains an interesting list of printed editions and translations, and a secondary bibliography which makes a valiant and largely successful attempt to select solid but serviceable works for the interested student. There are, however, some unfortunate omissions, which the reader should note: e.g., Jacques Maritain, *True Humanism* and *A Preface to Metaphysics*; Etienne Gilson, *Being and Some Philosophers*; James F. Anderson, *The Bond of Being* and *The Cause of Being*; Henri de Lubac, *Sur Naturel*, and W. R. O'Connor, *The Eternal Quest*; and some of the writings of M. D. Chenu and others on the nature of scholastic "theology."

Several other defects should be noted. (a) There are next to no explanatory notes, despite the rather technical character of much of the material. Not even the structure of the *quaestio* is explained, although to fail to do this is to encourage some unwary reader to cite an objection as a statement of Aquinas' views! (b) The "General Introduction" is not wholly satisfactory. It draws an exaggerated contrast between Aquinas and Augustine, for example in the statement (p. 28) that the latter could only find an analogy between the human soul (out of the whole created world) and God. There is too much "mysticism" in the interpretation of Anselm's "ontological argument" (p. 25) and Aquinas' "five ways" (p. 26). A comment on p. 28 suggests an astounding lack of appreciation of the Thomist metaphysics of "existence," as expounded by Gilson and others. The comment on the meaning of "justification" not only assumes that the common Protestant view is "normal," but also fails to indicate that Aquinas' usage has a good many precedents, including Augustine (p. 30). Most serious, perhaps, there is no explicit reference to the role of the Aristotelian concept of *physis (natura)* in the Thomist doctrine of nature and the supernatural. (c) In the translation, there are gaps in the "prologues" to some of the questions, at points where a few more lines from Aquinas' statement of plan would have given a fuller picture of the total pattern of the work. (d) The documentation is inadequate. No references to modern editions are given for quotations from Augustine, while the list of "Bekker" references for Aristotle is incomplete. Anselm and Abélard are cited, apparently by volume and page or column number, but with no indication of the edition used. Hugh of St. Victor appears as "Hugo St. Victor" and Peter Lombard

(rather obscurely, for the average reader) as "Magister." Biblical quotations tend to follow the AV, while footnotes contain what seem to be translations of the Vulgate readings, identified as "Migne."

Nonetheless, despite its definite limitations, this volume should help to further the knowledge of Aquinas' work. The "Library" is fortunate to have found so sympathetic and interested an editor. Mr. Fairweather (who is, incidentally, not related to this reviewer) is already well known to students of St. Thomas for his interesting study of Aquinas and Barth, *The Word as Truth* (London, 1944), which, with misplaced modesty, he omitted from his own bibliography.

EUGENE R. FAIRWEATHER

Associate Professor of Dogmatic Theology, Trinity College, Toronto, Canada.

Otherworldliness and the New Testament. By AMOS N. WILDER. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1954. 124 pp. \$1.75.

This is a book of notable value. It is brief, written with immediate clarity and concreteness both of thought and phrase, and more full of substance than most books that extend to many more pages.

Professor Wilder is dealing with what he rightly says to be a serious road-block between many men and Christian faith: namely, that Christianity is altogether otherworldly and has nothing to say concerning immediate human problems. To such men Christianity seems a kind of false spirituality and unworthy escapism.

In the first chapter, "Modern Faith and the Charge of Otherworldliness," Professor Wilder examines this charge with candid recognition and shows how it is linked with an inadequate realization of the truth that "the Bible is a very human book and warns against any kind of false spirituality or idealism." Any understanding, therefore, of the Old Testament or the Gospels "which disassociate these from man's natural affections and common needs is bound to be wrong."

The second chapter is a critique of New Testament theology today, which points out some of its dangers in narrowly identifying Christianity only "with religious concepts, right ideas about God, religious truth," instead of with deeper and wider facts of actual life experience.

The third chapter, perhaps the most excitingly important part of the whole book, is on "The Jesus of History and Modern Docetism," the message of which can be gathered from this final paragraph. "Here is a clue, then, to the way in which the historical Jesus can be made truly contemporary. He was not a phantom. He was not an angel. He was not a myth. He was a flesh and blood Jewish patriot through whom God spoke and acted at the crossroads of history. God wrought salvation through him for the centuries and the continents just because he lived a real life amid real issues."

The fourth and last chapter is on "The Resurrection Faith and a Relevant Salvation," and its purpose and content are exactly suggested by those words.

Altogether, this is a book which will speak to contemporary people and will help many who have been failing, through what has seemed to them the vagueness or unrelatedness of some contemporary theology, to realize instead that the Christian gospel, rightly understood, was and is related to the difficulties and possibilities of our actual existence here and now.

WALTER RUSSELL BOWIE

Professor of Homiletics, Virginia Theological Seminary, Alexandria, Virginia.

Rediscovering Prayer. By JOHN L. CASTEEL. New York: Association Press, 1955. xiii-242 pp. \$3.50.

Dr. Casteel provides us with an intelligent modern, sensitive, and dedicated discussion of prayer. His is not a pietistic book, although it is morally and spiritually profound. This is not a book of the obvious, although there are no aspects of the subject of prayer which have been ignored. Literary and theological allusions are numerous and provocative, and mark Dr. Casteel for the scholar he is.

In a period when the culture is in flux and values confused; when theology is being restated with profit to all and the Bible is being rediscovered, men are asking again about validity in communication with the Infinite. What are the means of knowing God and his Spirit? How does one listen and how does one speak so that he is in undeniable contact with the Ultimate?

The book is designed primarily for laymen. However, no minister or Student Christian Movement worker can afford to miss it. The author opens his volume with a discussion entitled "Where Praying Begins," and teaches his readers about God's initiative. "The Adoration of God" and "The Human Conditions of Prayer" are vividly presented, and are followed by "Prayer and the Forgiveness of Sin." "The Joyful Acceptance of Life" (thanksgiving) is one of the finest chapters, and paves the way for "Prayer as Asking and Receiving." Dr. Casteel then turns to ways, disciplines, and decisions which affect one's prayer life. He concludes with discussions of "The Outgoing Action of Prayer," "Devotional Reading," the church and other forms of "The Communal Life of Prayer," ending the book with telling comments on "Growth in Prayer" and perseverance in times of discouragement.

On such practical and puzzling questions as life and death, the "answer" to prayer, the "personal" nature of God, and the relation of science to Christianity, the author is lucid and unmistakable. Here is no shilly-shallying with the "givens" of God in his dealings with man; no easy overoptimistic view of a God who is less than sovereign. The outgrowth of such a discussion is recognition of the disciplines imposed by the imperatives of biblical Christianity. The author is specific, some will feel too much so, in describing the time, the place, the way, and ways of individual worship. Corporate worship and the significance it gives to the total life of holiness is likewise set forth.

Why is this book important? Because it deals with the heart of the Christian experience—worship—on the basis of the best current theology. Dr. Casteel indulges in no sentimentality, no unrealism. He is never out of touch with those assumptions about the nature of man and of God upon which present-day theology rests its case. He knows that God was in Christ reconciling the world to himself.

Some will feel that the average layman is unready for the specificity and the strong intellectual base here provided. Some will feel that the disciplines are too stern and the concepts too profound. This reviewer replies that few books deal so firmly yet so gently with the indestructible laws of spiritual growth. Until the lay worshiper sees the meaning behind his prayers and is confronted with the theology of Christian worship, he is a prey to sentimentalism, to casualness, and to magical formulations. Unfortunately too many laymen assume that prayer and worship are easily come by and almost automatically done. The strange paradox is that that most costly of all Christian experiences, confrontation by God in prayer, is so natural and so urgent that it is often confused with effortlessness. Meaningfulness in living the Christian life is deeply related to totality of giving. We love the Lord our God

with all our hearts and minds and souls and bodies. So, and only so, we pray. Minds, feelings, persons, we bring to God in prayer.

Finally it needs to be reiterated that to us who live in times that try men's souls, there can be no adventure and no solace in a faith whose center is not communion with God, and whose circumference is less than life lived in God's continuing presence.

WINNIFRED WYGAL

Formerly Director of Religious Resources, National Board, Y.W.C.A. Now writing and lecturing. New York City.

The Evolution of the Christian Year. By A. ALLAN McARTHUR. Greenwich, Conn.: The Seabury Press, 1955. 192 pp. \$3.00.

The former Chaplain at the University of Aberdeen has in this learned volume made a searching historical investigation of the growth and development of the liturgical year. Prompted by what he calls "the rediscovery of the Christian Year in the Church of Scotland," as evidenced by the 1940 Book of Common Order, he has subjected the materials of the patristic period to careful study, feeling that the Scottish Reformers of the sixteenth century went to an unnecessary extreme in abandoning the whole structure of the Church Year except for Sunday. The contemporary Scottish liturgical movement is, he feels, too closely patterned after the Anglican Book of Common Prayer which was "a sixteenth-century purification of the Western tradition of the time," needing re-examination in the light of the historical materials which are available now but were not accessible to the Reformers. The cardinal Reformation principle that church tradition is to be criticized in the light of the Word of God is valid, he believes, but he holds that new developments which are in line with the New Testament are authentic signs of the Spirit's continuing guidance of the church.

His studies convince him that the primitive liturgical year consisted of three festivals: Epiphany, Pascha, and Pentecost. In the fourth century three new festivals were added. Epiphany, which had been a unitive festival celebrating the Birth and Baptism of Jesus, was restricted to the commemoration of the Baptism, the stories of the Magi and of the turning of water into wine being also connected with it in certain regions, while Christmas was introduced to celebrate the Birth. In the same era Pascha was divided into two festivals, Good Friday and Easter, while Ascension Day was added to the festival of Pentecost which had previously had a dual significance as a unitive celebration of the Ascension and the Gift of the Spirit.

In the light of his historical studies and of contemporary needs, Dr. McArthur advocates a revision of the Church Year. He would have the life of Our Lord manifested in orderly sequence, but also the whole biblical revelation of "the work of God the Father in Creation and Providence, and the work of God the Holy Spirit in the Church and in the hope of the Kingdom of God," thus linking the Year and the Creed. (His emphasis on the Kingdom suggests the season of "Kingdomtide" as designated in the plan for the Church Year put forward some years ago by the Federal Council of Churches, although he avoids the use of the unfortunate title.) Specifically he suggests a group of Sundays before Advent to emphasize Creation and Providence; six Sundays in Advent to stress the preparation in the Old Testament for the Incarnation; the season from Epiphany to Good Friday to be centered on the Ministry and Passion; Easter to the Sunday after Ascension to celebrate the Resurrection, Ascension and Second Coming; Pentecost and some Sundays thereafter to stress the Church, Word and Sacraments; the remaining Sundays after Pentecost for the Christian Hope.

The Christian Year is today being restudied in the ecumenical movement and in particular communions. This book brings to light in scholarly fashion the background in history against which contemporary decisions must be made. It will be helpful to church leaders who are willing to do the painstaking work of following its research and of appraising its argument.

MORGAN P. NOYES

Central Presbyterian Church, Montclair, New Jersey.

The Universe and You. By HELEN HOWELL NEAL. Laguna Beach, California: Carlborg-Blades, Inc., 1954. 326 pp. \$4.00.

"It might be described as a course in the emergence of philosophy out of biology," writes philosopher William Ernest Hocking in his foreword to this book. A better "one-sentence" review of the book would be hard to find; yet I think that to substitute the word "religion" for "philosophy" in Hocking's statement would perhaps give a more accurate picture of what the book is about.

Helen Howell Neal wrote *The Universe and You* from notes prepared by her late husband, Professor Herbert Neal, distinguished biologist and teacher at Tufts College. However, since Mrs. Neal is a biologist in her own right, in the writing of this book from another's notes (an extremely difficult thing to do!) she has shown an unusual ability to preserve Neal's scientific and philosophical or religious concepts as well as to contribute her own.

One is fascinated by the sweep of scientific interest which the book reveals. The evolution of life is traced from the "cosmic dust" which formed the solar system and the planet earth, through the agelong process from the simplest forms of life to that of ever greater complexity, until the conscious mind of man appears.

Quite evidently the Neals found this latest product of biological chemistry—the human mind—to be the problem child of the universe, i.e. so far as any neat, foolproof scientific explanation of its emergence is concerned. Though, of course, mind is rooted in biological chemistry, as is all life, plant or animal, yet it escapes purely scientific explanation and definition. It hints at something beyond nature for its explanation.

The three philosophical systems—Naturalism, Dualism, Idealism—which have wrestled with this "problem child" are considered. Naturalism, which claims that nature is all there is and that mind, therefore, must be solely the product of nature, is rejected as inadequate to explain all the observable facts. Dualism, which tries to straddle the problem by saying that material nature and mind are separate realities, is also rejected as inadequate. It cannot explain, for example, the "oneness" of body and mind in a human being. "What my body does, *I do.*" Idealism, which sees universal mind as the ultimate reality, is the only philosophy adequate to account for the emergence of mind from the evolution of life. This is the author's conclusion.

But Helen Neal does not stop here. With the proper restraint of a scientist who knows the limits of her field she does not discuss religion as such in this book. Yet, throughout, reverent questions are asked, and though no dogmatic answers are given, the reader is led to seek for answers in something beyond, and more inclusive than science. Indeed, as one reads the book, there comes a growing feeling that its real message is hidden in these unanswered questions, the answers to which must be the affirmations of religious faith; and that the author intended it to be so!

DONALD J. CAMPBELL

Suffragan Bishop, The Diocese of Los Angeles, Los Angeles, California.

Book Notices

A new Quarterly is being started by the Epworth Press in London (25-35 City Road, London E. C. 1), entitled *The Preacher's Quarterly*, edited by J. Alan Kay. Vol. I No. 1 came out in December, 1954, and included among its contributors S. B. Frost, Herbert Butterfield, C. A. Coulson, John Foster, J. A. Findlay, H. G. G. Herklots, Gordon Rupp, Norman Snaith. The Quarterly attempts to "give the preacher, whatever his denomination, and whether he is a minister or a layman, the help he needs in his work." It includes articles not only about preaching, public worship, Bible, theology, church history, but also some on relevant aspects of social life, science, the arts. It is hoped that other than Methodist writers will increasingly contribute. Single copy, 3/6; annual subscription, 13/6.

Harper & Brothers has recently put out the tenth issue of its *Annotated Bible Series*, on *The Gospel of Matthew*. This commentary by Frederick C. Grant is in two seventy-five-cent volumes. The series, all in small paperback format, uses the King James Version; the Old Testament books have been done by Julius A. Bewer, the New by Dr. Grant. In the present work new evidence is adduced for the priority of Mark in the order of the Gospels, as named in a mosaic found at Ravenna; and a new interpretation is given to "this rock" in 16:18, as referring neither to Peter nor to his faith but to the divine revelation which had just been given to the "rock-man."

The Second Book of Maccabees, English translation by Sidney Tedesche, introduction and commentary by Solomon Zeitlin (Harper, \$4.00), is the fourth in a series of new editions of the Jewish apocryphal literature, under supervision of the Dropsie College Editorial Board. II Maccabees, a semi-legendary and "religious" approach to the history of the Maccabean period, "opens new vistas in the development of later Judaism and early Christianity."

The New American Library (501 Madison Avenue, New York City) has launched a series of "Mentor Religious Classics" (paperbacks), including the Scriptures of the world's great religions and important ancillary writings. Recent Christian works in this fifty-cent edition are *The Age of Belief: The Medieval Philosophers*, selections from their writings edited by Anne Fremantle of Fordham University (published also in hard cover by Houghton Mifflin); and *Here I Stand*, Roland Bainton's life of Luther which received the Abingdon-Cokesbury award in 1950.

Willis B. Glover, Jr., of Southern Methodist University, author of "The Old Evangelicalism and the New" in our Spring 1954 issue, has written a book, *Evangelical Nonconformists and Higher Criticism in the Nineteenth Century*, published by the Independent Press, London (17/6). This fully documented work "fills a gap in the history of Protestant Evangelicalism," rejects several previous assumptions in this field, and especially throws light on the period at the end of the century when the inerrancy of the Bible was first seriously in question.

Two small Macmillan books should be noted: *Temptation*, by Dietrich Bonhoeffer (\$1.25), written before his imprisonment but now first translated into English, is another demonstration of this true martyr's simple yet deep theological thinking. It "proceeds from the temptations in Adam and in Christ to the concrete temptations of daily life." *The Candlelight Kingdom*, by Ruth Korper (\$2.75), is subtitled "A Meeting with the Russian Church." Mrs. Korper is an American lay Protestant who, while living in Oxford, England, became interested in the Russian Orthodox Church

and learned much about it, especially from the noted Orthodox scholar Nicolas Zernov, who writes a cordial introduction to the book. A skillful writer of short stories and plays, she knows how to transmit vivid impressions to the reader. She sketches the history of the Eastern churches and the place of the Church in the past and contemporary history of Russia; appreciates its rituals, its deep sense of fellowship, its treasures of spiritual culture.

A first book by Howard Conn, minister of the Plymouth Congregational Church in Minneapolis, is called *The Hope That Sets Men Free* (Harper, \$2.50). It offers the lay reader a clear down-to-earth approach to "the Christian hope." In contrast to the current secular hopes by which men live, Dr. Conn sets forth the surer hopes grounded in the teaching of our Lord and in fellowship with him. Says Elton Trueblood in his foreword: "He faces frankly the problem of the 'Second Coming' and deals with it by taking his readers to deeper principles than those ordinarily mentioned."

Charles B. Templeton, Canadian-American evangelist for awhile associated with the National Council of Churches, has reached millions all over North America and several European countries by travel and television, without being a fundamentalist. He has now compiled some of his religious talks in a small book, *Life Looks Up* (Harper, \$2.50). With a Princeton theological education and with native wit and enthusiasm, he is an effective evangelist on a high level.

Making Sense Out of Life, by Charles Duell Kean (Westminster, \$2.50), is written out of the author's work in the parish ministry. (Formerly in Kirkwood, Mo., he is now Rector of the Church of the Epiphany, Washington, D. C.) He finds the Christian faith "as functional in the twentieth century as in the first," and drives home its relevance to the basic problems of daily life. Chapters include: "Christianity Makes Sense Out of Life," "Death and Guilt," "Meeting Life's Demand," "The Cross," "The Reformation," "Love—the Impossible Alternative," "The New Order of the Ages," "The Confident Fellowship."

John Edward Lantz has a new book, *Speaking in the Church* (Macmillan, \$3.75). "This expert guide explains the best techniques of good speech as they apply specifically to the religious situation." "The experienced minister will find that the book will improve his effectiveness as a speaker and thus increase his value to his congregation. The beginning minister and the student will find the basis for a career of successful speaking."

The Philosophical Library has published another British book in the field of "the sects": *Inside Buchmanism*, by Geoffrey Williamson (\$4.75). Mr. Williamson, a former editor and writer with an extensive experience of fact-finding investigations, made a prolonged and painstaking inquiry, openly and with cooperation (up to a point) from the leaders of the movement. He finds the opening of the political phase of the movement during World War II under the name "Moral Rearmament" a highly significant turning point in its history. Unlike some other investigators, he was not converted.

E. H. L.

